

ETHICAL
ISSUES
FOR THE
EIGHTIES

1980 Christian Life Commission
Seminar
Proceedings

SOUTHERN BAPTIST HISTORICAL
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES
Nashville, Tennessee

\$2.50

Foreward

81
The Christian Life Commission's 1980 national seminar on ~~ETHICAL ISSUES FOR THE EIGHTIES~~ had 450 registrants from 25 states to hear and enter into dialogue with highly competent and stimulatingly provocative program personalities.

The addresses from this meeting are provided in this printed form primarily as a reporting service to seminar registrants. The speakers prepared these addresses for oral presentation to a live audience. Therefore this material should not be perceived and judged as if it had been carefully written for formal publication in book form.

It is hoped, however, that these printed addresses will enable both those who were present in New York for the seminar and many who were not present but who are interested in the subject of ethical issues in the decade ahead to profit from the messages of these distinguished speakers.

Special acknowledgement and thanks are due W. David Sapp, who served as chief planner and coordinator of this meeting, and to the other Christian Life Commission staff members who worked long and hard to make the seminar a success: Susan Ballard, David Currie, Jean S. David, William H. Elder, III, Harry N. Hollis, Jr., Karen Roberts, William M. Tillman, Jr., Mary Elizabeth Tyler, Edith Wilson, and John A. Wood.

We hope these printed proceedings may substantially enlarge the usefulness and impact of the 1980 seminar on ETHICAL ISSUES FOR THE EIGHTIES.

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

Table of Contents

**Proceedings
of the 1980
Christian Life Commission Seminar on
ETHICAL ISSUES FOR THE EIGHTIES
The Roosevelt Hotel
New York, New York
March 24-26, 1980**

Subject

Page

"Ethical Issues for the Eighties: A Framework for Inquiry"	5
Martin E. Marty, Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor, University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago, Illinois	
"The Eighties: Toward an End to Hunger"	7
Frances Lappé, Author, Lecturer, and Co-founder, Institute for Food and Development Policy, San Francisco, California	
"Energy and the Future"	13
Barry Commoner, University Professor of Environmental Science, Washington Univer- sity, St. Louis, Missouri	
"Southern Baptists Facing the Issues of the Eighties"	20
Albert McClellan, Associate Executive Secretary, Executive Committee, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tennessee	
"Facing the Crisis in Education"	26
R. Kirby Godsey, President, Mercer University, Macon, Georgia	
"An Economic Ethic for an Uncertain Decade"	30
J. Philip Wogaman, Dean and Professor of Christian Social Ethics, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C.	
"A New Day for Families"	33
Jim Guy Tucker, Chairman, National Advisory Committee, White House Conference on Families, Washington, D.C.	
"Race Relations in the Eighties"	37
Benjamin Hooks, Executive Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, New York	
"Personal Life Style: An Issue for the Eighties"	41
Ramsey Clark, Attorney, Clark, Wulf, Levine, and Peratis, New York, New York	
"The Prospects for Peace: International Issues in the Eighties" ..	44
Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, New York, New York	

6-7

"Church-State Issues in the Coming Decade"	46
John M. Swomley, Jr., Professor of Christian Ethics, St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, Missouri	
"Women in the Eighties"	50
Sarah Weddington, Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D.C.	
"Ever Rethinking the Lord's Prayer"*.....	54
R. Buckminster Fuller, Author, Educator, Architect, and Inventor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	
"Summary and Evaluation"	56
W. David Sapp, Director of Organization, Christian Life Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tennessee	
"The Visitation of God "	56
Jimmy Allen, President, Radio and Television Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Fort Worth, Texas	

* At the request of R. Buckminster Fuller, the text for "Ever Rethinking the Lord's Prayer" is substituted in these printed proceedings for his seminar address entitled "Technology and Ethics in the Eighties."

Ethical Issues for the Eighties: A Framework for Inquiry

Martin E. Marty

In the division of labor at this meeting, I am not to catalogue, rank, or address the many issues of the eighties. Experts in many fields will do that. My assignment is to provide a framework for inquiry about them all. I shall first cite seven generally positive elements, then three hazards, and thus conclude with ten points as the skeleton of framework for discussion.

1. The eighties will help us forget and move beyond the models we had in the sixties. Mention that you were at a Christian Life Commission meeting on ethical issues for the eighties and church folk back home, without doubt, will type you as having entered a zone marked by "Christian social activism." Such people carry still a model from the 1960s, when the ethical address code named activism bore three marks:

(a) denominational and ecumenical pronouncements that may or may not have been representative of local support groups in the church; (b) demonstrations, giving visibility to causes by taking them to the streets; (c) bureaucratic language disclosing the concept of the church as a quasi-political power among the powers, one that lived off a spiritual capital in which others invested.

One of the nice things about the eighties is that the sixties are receding from living memory; by the end of the eighties more than half the American people will not have been born when Kennedy made his inaugural address, Pope John came to power and visibility, Martin Luther King emerged as a moral force, or the World Council of Churches still possessed real power. Only a small percentage of the American people in the later years of this decade will have had an adult experience of the great social changes inspired in part by the churches in the mid-sixties. They will have to go not to their own memories but to textbooks to get such stories.

Good. We are not living in the sixties, a decade which I contend did, for all its ambiguity and polarity, produce breakthroughs in social justice that appear to be congruent with many biblical mandates. What worked then does not work now; what seemed true then is not always verifiably true now. But worst of all, the vividness of expression in that decade deprived us of awareness that American churches have used many, many, often conflicting models and approaches and we should not be captive of one.

In 1976 I once rattled off what some of these approaches were, and shall do so now not to do justice to them but simply to dazzle the inquirers: Spain's Las Casas using preaching, sacramental rites, and bargaining with the King in an effort to ward off slavery of New World peoples; New England and southern colonial theocrats who established churches where the saints should rule; Baptists and Quakers in dissent suggesting other ways for spirit to move and conscience to speak for justice and rights; Enlightened Deists writing ethics into statecraft; New

Amsterdam Dutch folk "conniving" to find new models in church and state; Great Awakeners and Methodist pioneers working with the warmed and changed heart of individuals and cells; evangelical millennialists working to make the world attractive to a returning Christ; moralists and millennialists building a benevolent empire, an "errand of mercy" that still is the basis for voluntarism; black freedmen's bureaus and evangelical and liberal abolitionists; Jewish collectives, bureaus, and agencies; the rise of Catholic social thought in the 1890s on the lines of papal encyclicals but cherishing a free society; the Protestant liberal Social Gospel and its successor between the World Wars, Christian realism; 1960s social activism; the newer evangelical awakening of conscience, et cetera et cetera. Let the sixties take their rightful place while we take responsibility for doing fresh thinking for the eighties.

2. At root: the ethics of character. To everyone's surprise, after decades of talk about establishments, structures, and complexes, we have found the public still concerned about who runs them, and who the 'who' really is. The issue lives on in the 1980 presidential campaign and, rightfully or wrongfully, may help determine the primary election outcomes. One kind of cynic, usually a tired sort of reactive Catholic journalist, will complain that support of the McGoverns or the Andersons shows an enduring Puritan streak in American life, an evangelical moralism. But D. W. Brogan long ago showed that as rural Puritanism faded among Protestants, it moved to the Catholic cities--remember the Legion of Decency, and all that?--and on a precinct-by-precinct basis you will see Americans busy with the issue of character.

There may be hypocrisy in this quest by a public that lives by few codes and cheats on those it lives by. It may be a search for surrogate holiness of the sort that once was transferred to ministers. But it may also be a yearning for a better life, a protest against mere impersonalism, a quest for models and heroes/heroines. At the very least, the churches should see in it a tie to what they profess to be about.

The fact that we have had ten years of evangelical-pentecostal-fundamental and other religious revivals has not necessarily produced a greater quantum of good character in American religious circles. Mary McCarthy tilted correctly when she claimed that religion made good people good and bad people bad. But the potential is there for developing people of character who, in Aristotle's terms seek good ends with good means until it becomes habitual. Or who, in Thomas a Kempis title, seek the imitation of Christ. Something good could come of this search.

3. We should begin to see the move from merely private morale toward civic, social, and public morale. Robert Heilbroner calls "private morale" that approach to life that lives off late-capitalism but makes no contribution to the republic. "I'll get mine;" How to Prosper in the Coming Hard Times; get an M.B.A. without learning how to justify the system behind it. Self-ism will live on, of course, and there will be moral and material hoarders and packrats. But we see some signs that at last some of the public is relearning that "we are members one of

another."

There are civic responses we can make to the urgent issues of the day, but we have lost the impulse to seek a measure of consensus juris, to find discourse appropriate to a republic, to learn measures of empathy and responsiveness to go with our pluralism, and to move from bumper-sticker warfare or confusion to creative disagreement and occasional agreement. The church has had moments when it contributed to public morale, mores, and morals, and it can do so again. But leaders lay and clerical have to put a premium on such discourse. Many of the prospering religious groups are escapes from or agencies of hostility to such a polis, an interactive human city. But churches should have more staying power than sellers of flags at Lake Placid, whose patriotism may be momentary, reactive, and largely hostile.

4. While it will face new challengers, the impulse toward local ethical expression in Christianity will continue. Local-based ethical expression was first voiced against remote and impersonal bureaucracy, and assured that Christian people had a more direct say in churchly voice and action. Now it is threatened by new forms of religious organization through the medium of public media--about which more, later. But between its hazards, local initiative lives on. Sometimes it is born out of localized threats and responses: Youngstown and steel, Three Mile Island and nuclear problems, and the like--though they should be seen as parables of potentially universal problems.

Just as often they are born of local peoples' creative address to problems beyond their locale: in response to the needs of boat people, in dealing with the aged, migratory workers, and the like. My own infra-red camera of American cities I visit shows many networks of local churches engaged in acts of altruism, sacrifice, and love. Their critics may say that these deal with the victims and not the structural agents of evil in the world, but if they are baby-steps, they are steps--welcomed by victims, who gain dignity and learn from them. "Liberation Theology," I surmise--unless America has unimaginable levels of social disruption in the eighties--will remain the language of seminary elites and bureaucratic task forces, though one hopes that its arcane setting will not prevent some of its themes from breaking through: the biblical notion of God siding with the poor, the oppressed, and the like. Local-based expression should stimulate a larger Christian imagination about issues beyond the local.

5. We should see a recovery of awareness that technical problems imply some measure of technical solutions, and that churches can be agencies of connection. I laud the "simple lifestyle" directions in Christian ethics as being intrinsically valuable and good for raising of consciousness. But they dare not lapse into a back-to-nature romanticism that will act as if pollution will go away, homes will be heated, and the hungry will eat if only the sun shines, the wind blows, and we pray a lot. The great ethical issues of the eighties--having to do with the social effects of inflation, nonrenewable energy resources, ecology and environment, bodily care and health services delivery, to name a few, will demand conversation between experts and publics. Every Christian congregation has some of these techni-

cal resources, beginning with today's new-style farmer or the town banker or physician. They read page one of the Bible and recite line one from the Creed--a good clue to the priority of Christian interest in the created world that, once fallen, God redeems in Christ. So the theological root and motive is there. But then comes know-how of a sort not needed for some of the ethical issues that divided us from 1945-1980.

6. There will be more erosion of the line between mainline and other Christian ethical intentions. The Protestant-Catholic mainline has seen some recovery of spirituality, tradition, definition, and experience--enough to lead its members away from bureaucratic models of social action in the church. And the evangelical-pentecostal-conservative-orthodox nexus includes a significant number of people who have relearned the biblical fusion of soul-saving and saving. We look to no particular group of Young Evangelicals for all wisdom on this front, knowing that their clubs would be dwarfed by the often repudiative financial appeals and crowd draws of some anti-republic evangelizers. But there is no stopping of the forces that erupt here and there and everywhere, that belong to no club and are confined by no bureau--of people who have chosen some ethical address to the urgent questions. Look for less "we" and "they" between the responsive in what were once two camps.

7. The eighties will see a rebirth of global Christian awareness. We have seen the individualistic and diffuse spiritualism or, at best, mere localism, in much of the revival of the dozen years past. But toward the end of them we saw fresh awarenesses of Christian involvement everywhere. The boat people helped, as did Baptist dissidents in Russia, or missionary victims in Rhodesia, or the death of Steve Biko, or the Nobel of Mother Teresa. This is the decade in which for the first time the Christian majority will be in the southern hemisphere. Charismatics, evangelical missionaries, world-travelers, Christians aware afresh of the Muslim world--all these are promoting new linkages between "our" and "other" worlds. We stand some chance of turning Christian again, about the universal dimensions of the faith, if we use the Book of Acts as a model.

There are hazards.

1. The dangers of the new apocalypticism. Those of us who know the history of the year 1000 fear the approach of the year 2000, only a decade after the period we now plan for ends. The commercial attractiveness of gnostic-insider "we" and "they" language about being at the right place for the Second Coming combined with the year 2000 will inspire at just the wrong moment an obsession with apocalypticism. We are already well into the flood of it.

To say something good for end-of-the-world language: it keeps alive the biblical sense of urgency about mission, and it is one form of witness to the fact that the Lord of history who holds the times and is another form of witness to the fact that the power of God is not limited to the petty pace of our times and days and earth. Beyond that almost all apocalyptic commercialism is a negative effect. It misapplies scripture, creates false senses of awareness of the signs of the times, and--in my one-

line review of Hal Lindsey's books, shows people like its author "giving up on the world before God does." Such apocalypticism legitimates my getting right with God, my rescuing others, my prideful living with knowledge that only my group reads the newspapers right and--all too often--hedonism about the world which we can do little to serve.

2. The simplism of electronic clienteles and convergences. I resist the temptation to do a full-dress account of the biggest internal problem for conservative Christianity: the rise of celebrities who attract and often exploit clienteles and convergences of people apart from their own local churches or traditions. The media create climates of plausibility and induce the broadcasters to reduce ethical issues to simplisms. A simple challenge: listen to the appeals of the front-runners against pornography and obscenity and evolution in school texts and the courts and the liberals and the humanists and the homosexuals and--granting the validity of some of their perspectives and causes--ask yourself: do they ever say, or dare say, anything that might judge or offend anyone in their actual or prospective clienteles? Dare they inconvenience anyone in the camp? Most of all, give them their whole program, all they want: would there be less injustice, inequality, or poverty in the world? Then check the biblical space devoted to the two sets of issues, the one for which they pass out badges and the one they cannot address.

Deriding them does no good. We have to show how a Born Again republic within the republic would only add one more tribe to those of Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, Black Muslims, and other intractable groups. That its progenitors are not using the only or maybe even a legitimate model of post-theocratic Christendom. That they choose emotionally attractive distractions from harder issues. That they engage in badge and bumper-sticker warfare that does not address itself to the actual conditions of freedom and pluralism. That some of their discontents may be validly based on shared concerns but their search for conspirators makes it possible for them to confuse delicate issues.

3. The eighties then will see new forms of Christian tribalism. Instead of reacting in horror from the Ayatollah or Soviet models, many of the new Christian militants are duplicating their language: if "they" have an unyielding ideology, "we" need one, too. I do believe that in a time of great moral evil, ethical shortcoming, and visionary confusion, coupled with a loss of identities, it is natural and valuable that Christian sub-communities "get their own acts together." They have a right to nurture their own ways of life in partial separation from each other. But these sub-communities share some dimensions of community with other kinds of Christians, and with humans in general. The Lord of history controls all of history and works also among many who do not know Jesus Christ. It is possible to link up with them without losing the clarity of attachment to Christ; it is not possible to refuse to address the world's great issues while claiming to be living out the commands of God, or responding to God's promises.

The Eighties: Toward an End to Hunger

Frances Lappé

I would like to begin with an introduction of myself--how it is that I got from Fort Worth, Texas. In effect, what path took me to arrive at this podium? Because I find that whenever I sit in an audience my first question is, what led that person to think that they had something to say to me? After my introduction, I will confront five of the basic myths of World Hunger that keep so many people paralyzed. And the final portion of my address I will devote to a broader look, asking what are the fundamental, philosophical, and ethical approaches to a solution to needless hunger?

I would like to begin in the year 1966 when I graduated from Earlham College in Indiana. As you remember, that was a time of extreme anguish and desperation for many people, particularly young people, and certainly for me. The war was going on in Viet Nam, the Civil Rights movement was under way, and I very much had the feeling that if I did not solve America's problems tomorrow, in ten years maybe, that all seemed lost. I followed the guidance of people like Tom Hayden and other people who told us that what we needed to do was work with those who were suffering most, people who lived in the ghettos, for example.

I went to Philadelphia, and I worked with welfare recipients, helping to organize groups to make sure that welfare recipients received what they were due under the law. I worked in this role for a couple of years. As each day went by, I became more desperate and more unhappy because I realized that even if I succeeded each day in the task that I set out for myself, I would not be addressing the fundamental causes of this needless suffering that was so evident to me. The woman I worked most closely with died of a heart attack at the age of forty-two while I was working with her. I was convinced that she died of poverty. She simply died of the stress of poverty.

As I say, I was very unhappy; but I went on doing what I was doing because I didn't know what else to do. I suppose many, many people keep going because we just don't know what else to do until some point in our lives, when it gets too uncomfortable. We look forward in our lives, imagining that we remain on the same trajectory that we're on presently. And we find that we have to say no. That point came for me in 1968 and it led to the most important decision I've ever made--that and the decision to have children. It was the decision to stop doing anything until I knew why I was doing one thing as opposed to something else. In other words, I needed to understand how my action fit into the basic structural, systemic causes of needless suffering. It was a very difficult decision. I was one who very much grounded my own self-esteem in being able to say "I am a community organizer" or "I am a social worker," but I resisted the fears and I more or less dropped out.

Now, of course, I can say all of this and sound very dramatic but friends have said, "Well, why were you nervous about dropping out in Berkeley in the 1960s? Isn't that what everybody was doing?" But I was afraid that somebody might ask me what I did, and I wouldn't have an answer. Friends have pointed out that, "Well nobody ever asked people then what they did. The most you would be asked is what you were 'into'." But I was afraid I wouldn't even have an answer to that!

So I was really terrified, but in any case I did it, and I started studying on my own. For the first time I started learning. I started discovering that I really had interests of my own that I could pursue. I read very widely, and gradually I began to home in on the issue of food. I had an instinctive feeling that somehow, because food was so basic, if I could understand the roots of needless hunger, then I could get a handle on the basic, political, and economic systems. And I think that I was right. I haven't changed that focus in the last twelve years.

But in those early years, however, I was very much influenced by the ecology movement. Remember Earth Day in 1970? The Population Bomb exploded about that time, Paul Ehrlich's first popular book. Famine 1975, another very popular book, came out; I was strongly influenced by the idea that we were on a collision course--people versus resources--and that this collision was in fact happening; that famine was inevitable because of lack of resources to feed the growing population.

And I was then very eager to determine for myself how close we were to the earth's limits; so I discovered a quiet library in Berkeley. At that time the agricultural library was one hardly anybody ever went to so I found a little cubbyhole. And, I started reading; I also started auditing courses on everything from soil science to tropical geography.

In this process, and reading widely on political and economic issues, one day in the agricultural library I learned that in fact half of all the harvested acreage in the United States goes to feed livestock. It was one of those "aha" moments that I hope some of you can identify with. All the headlines were telling us, and all the experts that I had been reading were telling me, that we had reached the earth's limits--we were running out of food and land. And here, in my own modest study, I learned that half of the harvested acreage in the United States goes to feed livestock! I learned that a small fraction of that gets returned to people. I began to see that livestock were used as a disposal system in a world in which things are structured so that people who are hungry cannot make a demand on that grain. Livestock as disposals became a metaphor for me, a certain kind of case study in how the economic and political system causes hunger. It also began for me the process of demystifying the supposed experts--those who were supposed to have the answers for us. I realized that they were locked into a world view in which they couldn't put two and two together to come up with four.

So, it was a beginning, and I started writing. I wrote two pages. It was a hand-out that I was going to pass around among friends, demonstrating how we use livestock as a disposal system when livestock histori-

cally always have been used to convert non-edible foods into high-grade protein. But here in the United States we've turned the equation upside down and are getting rid of protein by feeding it to livestock. So I started with a couple of pages, and I said, "Well, you should really learn a little bit more about that." Then it became five and then it became Diet For a Small Planet, which was published in 1971.

Then, when the book was published in 1971 I became sort of the Julia Childs of the soybean circuit. Well, it wasn't exactly the role that I had been shooting for! But one has to decide whether or not to take what life offers, make the best of it, or reject a possible opportunity. And the opportunity for me in being the "Julia Childs of the soybean circuit" was to reach people who might not ever pick up a book on the political and economic causes of hunger. I went on talk shows all around the country. About half the time they said I could come on if I brought my own beans and rice and told people how, as Joe Collins once put it, "you can lose weight and make money on the coming world food crisis." Such was the level of intellectual and ethical depth of those talk shows.

As a moment of relief in the serious message I have for you today, I'll tell you about the nadir of that part of my life. It was in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on a mid-night talk show. You know how they always like to find a common ground among their guests? Well, the only other guest was a UFO expert and the only question I got that night was, "Ms. Lappe, what do you think they eat on UFO's?" I have learned, what every politician knows and something that has served me very, very well in the following five years--never listen to the question. I went from "what do they eat on UFO's?" to the roots of hunger. Now, it was a leap!

The next big change came--and I know my life sounds like a series of cataclysms and in a sense it has been--in 1974 when I went to Rome to the World's Food Conference. I'm sure many of you remember it. The world's attention was for the first time focused on the global food crisis. Government experts and multinational corporate executives were there supposedly to come to plan the end to global hunger; Henry Kissinger said that within ten years no child should go to bed hungry. I went to Rome in 1974 thinking that I would sort of rub elbows with those global experts, and I would get new insight and new momentum in my own work which was pretty lonely at that time. I was working on my own. Having two children, I worked when they were asleep, basically.

I went there and came back a very different person because in the space of a week, I made two very basic breakthroughs. One, I was very shocked that these supposed experts were still locked into a framework of analysis of the problem of world hunger that I had discarded based on my own independent study. That was very shocking for somebody who'd always been in awe of those experts as a little girl growing up in Fort Worth, Texas. Another thing that was very shocking was that people put their microphones to my mouth and they wanted to know what I thought. I wondered how could they want to know what I think.

So I came back with a very strong convic-

tion that is a basis of my talk today and all of my work, and that is that the problem of needless hunger, the outrage of needless hunger, will never be solved by government experts up there, some officials, some corporate executives devising a plan to end world hunger. It will only be solved, and hunger in our own country will only be solved, as each of us takes more power for ourselves, in other words, as we take greater responsibility for our economic and political system. We must imbue ourselves with the fundamental attitude of "If not me, who?" And that was what I came back from Rome with, that sense that no matter how inadequate I might feel, the real issue is "if not me, who?" Because it's not going to be done for us by those up there. Hunger is going to be overcome by more and more of us taking greater and greater responsibility.

So I came back from Rome with a much greater sense of the potential power that I could have. I rewrote Diet For a Small Planet and then was able to make the leap to commit myself to write the book Food First: Beyond the Myth of Scarcity. That brings you up to the founding of the Institute for Food and Development Policy. My talk today will not be one which really outlines our projects for you. I would love to do that. It would be much easier than what I'm setting for myself. But if you are interested in what our Institute does, what our projects are, what our publications are, I have brought with me publication catalogues. You can also write to us.

I'd now like to move into part two of my presentation; that is, to get into some of the analytical points that are the basis of our understanding of what is the appropriate responsibility for Americans who want to end the outrage of needless hunger. I'm really going to start at square one. I hope I don't insult any of you by going over information that you know. I think that the value in it might be that even if you feel you already know this information, there might be something in my presentation, in terms of the way it is formulated, that you might use to talk to other people who don't already share any of this perspective.

I will cover five of the basic myths that we feel keep people trapped, fearful, unable really to identify what is their appropriate responsibility.

The first one is the myth of scarcity. Many, many more people are understanding that the problem of hunger is not scarcity per se; it's not lack of food. Still if you went out on the street in New York today and asked people why there is such hunger in the world, the retort would invariably be some variation of "too many people or too little food." So I think we really have to begin with the myth of scarcity--the illusion of scarcity that is created by economic and political systems.

Let me just show you some of the ways that we address this myth. On the one hand, we can look at it globally, and we can show that on a global basis there are 3,000 calories produced in grain alone for every man, woman, and child on earth. That's more than most Americans consume, certainly more than we need. That's just grain. It does not include all the many other things that people eat. But, of course, what really matters is what is available to people or what is produced in countries where people are most hungry. So a lot of our work at the Institute

is to focus on those countries that are seen by many Americans as overpopulated, as hopelessly backward, as hopelessly poor.

We focus on countries like Bangladesh, for example. We have looked at a country like Bangladesh and discovered that even today some of the studies of the grain availability in Bangladesh indicate that if the grain were distributed equitably there would be enough now to feed everyone a minimally adequate diet. But the real point about a country like Bangladesh is the incredible agricultural potential that is yet untapped. It's estimated that if the Bangladesh production even began to live up to its potential, given its very rich soil and incredible water resources, that it could not only feed itself well but also be an agricultural exporter.

But if scarcity is not the cause of hunger, then what is the cause of hunger? I will have to state it very simplistically to make a thesis statement that will run throughout my talk: We identify the cause of hunger as the increasing concentration of control over food-producing resources in fewer and fewer hands from the village level to the level of international trade. In other words, what we see happening in most countries in the world today is not movement toward a solution, but movement in the opposite direction, or increasing concentration of control which has the effect of cutting people out of the production process and therefore increasingly out of consumption. We find that increasingly fewer people are making the decisions about how the resources are used and for whose benefit. This is true whether we are talking about credit or access to land; whether we are talking about access to needed agricultural inputs; or whether we are talking about the village level or the level of international trade where in every major commodity in international trade there are now from five to twelve corporations in control.

But let me move on to myth two because it ties in very closely with myth one. If you believe that the hunger in the world is caused by scarcity, then the solution obviously is more food. Production is seen as the solution. When I went to Rome in 1974 and again in 1979, people were saying that if somehow we could just produce more food, we could solve the problem of hunger. The clearest example of this strategy was what is called the "Green Revolution strategy"; that is, the introduction of new technologies, of better seeds, more better controlled water systems, more chemical pesticides and fertilizers--all of these things were seen as the solution because they would increase production. Much of our Institute's work has been to follow through on what are the consequences of this strategy, on the belief that hunger will be solved simply by focusing in on more food.

What are the consequences? What dynamic is set into motion when this analysis is presumed accurate? We have looked at country after country after country where the solution to hunger is sought in terms of greater production. We relied on studies from the International Labor Office, studies from the UN Research Institute for Social Development, studies done by independent researchers in many parts of the world. What we find is a very consistent, a very tragic and seemingly ironic, pattern--more food per

person and yet more hunger. In countries like India, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Mexico, and Brazil, in most of such countries, you find increasing production per person and yet greater hunger.

Now to understand why, we have to go back to what I said in the beginning. What happens when a new technology is interjected into a system that is basically unequal to begin with, where a few are in control of the land and the marketing? That new technology is monopolized by those who have access to: literacy, credit, political influence, enough land to make it work--all these things. What happens, if the issue of control is not first confronted, is that control becomes more unequal--greater concentration in the hands of fewer people. So, you have then the result of increasing landlessness, landlessness increasing faster than the natural population growth rate in a country like India or Mexico. You have increasing numbers of people who were tenants now being pushed off the land altogether to become landless laborers. The better-off farmers use the new technology and new credit availability to farm their land themselves instead of renting it out. So you have this process of increasing concentration over land, increasing landlessness, increasing joblessness, and increasing poverty. The result is more food and yet more hunger.

So then what happens to that greater food production? As the local market is undercut, there is an increasing concentration on exports. Obviously, if people are too poor to buy it locally, what is produced has to be exported. There's also an increase in the amount of staple foods being fed to livestock. In Brazil, for example, almost half of the basic staple foods are now being fed to livestock! In Mexico almost one-third are. In fact, it was estimated by a nutritionist in Mexico that as much grain is eaten by the livestock in Mexico as by the entire peasantry. So that's something of what happens when people are too poor to buy the food being produced.

I want to give you one other, to me, very vivid example. In one of the most productive rice-growing areas of India, where rice yields have almost tripled in the last fifteen or twenty years, the increasing numbers of landless laborers must survive by eating the rats that eat the harvested grain. Here is a very, very clear example of more food and yet the landless people do not have the income to take advantage of that increased production.

I'd like to move then on to myth three. I've made sweeping brush strokes, but I want you to know, of course, that all of our work at the Institute is to document in great detail these big strokes that I can make in a lecture like this. I hope you will be challenged to verify some of my big strokes. But I think the reason that many people resist the information I've presented about the myth of scarcity and the myth of the production solution is that they are trapped into myth three--the belief that there is a fundamental conflict between justice and production.

I don't know if you hold this, but I think you must have been exposed to people, I know I am regularly, who say, "Well, I agree with you. I agree with you a lot. But if, in fact, we had a redistribution of control over food-producing resources, if we did have a more democratic sharing in power over our

society's basic economic resources, the result would be less production. These big corporations, the big multinational firms or the big landlords have proven by their size, their growth, and their efficiency that they can effectively produce food.

So I think people feel very trapped, because, on the one hand, they can see how a very antidemocratic system where few are in control causes hunger because people cannot make demand on what is produced--they can see that. But on the other hand, they think, "Well, if we reverse that, if more people did share in control, production would be undercut. People would still go hungry but it would be for a different reason. It would be because production would be falling off."

So it's very important to be able to come to grips with this myth. And it's not entirely a myth in the sense that everytime an important social change takes place, it takes time for reorganization. That is understood.

But I want to address what I think are the misunderstandings. Number one is that many people who fear change because it might lower production are unable to see the inefficiency built into the current antidemocratic economic system, in other words, an economic system where few are in control. Take one example. In Central America, half of the land, the best land, is used to grow essentially five export commodities while the majority of people are poorly fed. Now the land may be very productive and used efficiently in terms of yields per acre (although I question that, as you'll see).

But we must redefine efficiency and define it always in terms of human need. We must take off the blinders and look afresh at how our resources are used, as if we were just coming down from Mars. Looking at how land is presently used in relation to human need, we must ask: Is that efficient?

Another assumption behind fear of change toward more just sharing of control is the idea that the big operator is the most effective and efficient and has all the business know-how. In fact, in our own country, as well as the third world, it is the small producer who produces more value per acre. We look at USDA figures in our own country; it's the family farmer who produces more value per acre than the big agribusiness operation. It's true in India. It's true in Brazil. It's true in Honduras. It's true in every study that we've looked at. Now there's no reason to romanticize a peasant producer or a family farmer to understand why they produce more. It's true because their lives depend on that productivity.

But that's another kind of argument that we can use to get through the myth that if we question centralization of control of power, then somehow we have to opt for inefficiency. I don't believe that is the necessary trade-off. In other words, there's tremendous inefficiency if we can just learn to perceive it in our own system.

Let's go back to Bangladesh for a moment. Ten percent of the landholders control fifty-one percent of the land in rural Bangladesh. That concentration of control makes many programs to increase productivity out of the question--programs, for example, to control the tremendous water resources in Bangladesh. Any of you familiar with that country know that it has periodic flooding; if that water

can be controlled, then it will be agriculturally useful; if not, it's a disaster.

Now, anyone who knows anything about irrigation, particularly in the history of Asia, knows the cooperative control of irrigation networks is the key to making them work. There has to be a sharing in the use of water's resource for the irrigation to be effective. Now, that kind of cooperation is out of the question when neighbors aren't neighbors, but rivals in a system where few are in control; where the big landlord is simply trying to figure out how he can get the poor more indebted to him so as to get their land. In that kind of atmosphere, cooperation is out of the question. And rice yields in Bangladesh remain one-sixth of those proven possible. So that has to be another, perhaps less tangible, less documentable, but I think very real, measure of the blocks to productivity built into a system where a few are in control. By allowing the few to control resources we undercut the possibilities for cooperation which would increase productivity.

Let me come back to the United States. What I hope you're getting if I jump back and forth between Bangladesh, for example, or another third-world country, and our own country is that I see many parallels. Although their living standards are certainly higher than those in the third world, I feel that U.S. farmers are very much victimized; they are very much powerless in a parallel way to a third-world farmer. They are made to compete with each other for survival. They do not have any control over the price they are going to be getting for their commodity. They are the victims of the monopoly control of the inputs that they need to make their land productive, such as machinery, for example; the Federal Trade Commission has documented the overcharge to farmers from the monopoly control of machinery, for example.

Because U.S. farmers are victimized, are forced to compete against each other to survive this year, they too are forced to abuse the land. It is not because they are not good farmers. They are forced to abuse the land in order to stay in business. And I have talked to many farmers who have told me they know that they shouldn't be planting the same crop year after year after year because of the increased risk of erosion. They say that they have no choice--they have to plant the most lucrative crop--because if they didn't they would just simply go out of business. What the Soil Conservation Service is now telling us is that many of our key farm areas have a level of soil erosion characteristic or greater than the Dust Bowl era. On any of the sloping land in Iowa today we are losing one bushel of top soil for every bushel of corn that is harvested.

Now, how does all this tie back into the myth of justice versus production? Well, this is simply an illustration of another measure of the inefficiency of the current economic system. We're forced to mine our basic agriculture resources for very short-term gain.

Another measure of inefficiency, and I think, again, that many are unable to perceive it, has to be what is produced. I've already alluded to this in relation to the third world. In an area like Central America where it's estimated that among children under five in many areas the rate of malnutrition is as high as fifty and in some places

eighty percent. And, yet, as I have already mentioned, half of the land, and the best half, is used for five export commodities.

Well, I see a parallel, several parallels, again in our own system. We have measurable hunger in the United States where seventeen million children live in debilitating poverty. More and more people cannot afford a balanced diet. This, on the one hand; and yet, on the other hand, in the last 10 years 53,000 new food items have been introduced in the marketplace in the United States. I would hazard a guess that 43,000 were basically gimmicks; some new version on some new version of something that none of us really needed in the first place! Yet the 50 food corporations that control T.V. food advertising now spend \$13 billion dollars yearly to convince people to buy these nonessentials. I contrast this with the fact that there are millions in the United States who are not able to eat a healthy diet because of their income. So these are some of the facts that we have to take into account when we say, "Well what we've got now is so inefficient. And if we thought of changing it, we'd have to lose that efficiency." We have to begin to take these measures of inefficiency in relation to human need in mind.

Now I would like to briefly go over myth four--the notion that somehow hunger is an issue of them versus us; the idea that people who live in the third world, sort of the "hungry hoards"; as Lyndon Johnson said, "They want what we got." In other words, we are in a contest with hungry people and if they eat better, then we have to somehow tighten our belts. I think that so many of the messages about the third world that come through to Americans are that their individual greed is responsible for hunger abroad and it makes people feel very guilty, very burdened, and very threatened. A lot of our work is to get us out of that box and to see that the hungry are neither a burden or perpetual threat to us; but, rather, if we really look at the structural causes of our problems, they are very similar--which makes us allies.

In other words, we can identify the increasing concentration of control over land, say in a country like the Philippines or Mexico, and we can also identify increasing concentration of control over food in our own economy. In our food system to look at the pinnacle of it, we can see there are fifty corporations now that control about two-thirds of the assets of the entire food industry. Researchers working at the University of Wisconsin and the Federal Trade Commission have estimated that if the present trend continues, those fifty food firms will come to control virtually all the assets of our food industry by the end of the century. Now that would mean that in any given food line--dairy, alcoholic beverages, bread, soups, whatever it was--there would essentially be monopoly control as there is now, for example, in cereals or soups. There may be many, many differences between our plight, our problems, and those of many third-world countries, but when we focus in on the issue of power, we find many parallels. A minister heard me speak recently and when I sat down he said my address reminded him of a sermon that he had heard, entitled the "Positive of Power Thinking." So I thought I would coin that as the informal title of my talk today, "The Positive

of Power Thinking," because when one looks beyond the differences in the level of consumption, one finds very strong parallels in terms of the distribution of power between many third-world countries and in our own country.

I am going to have to entirely skip over a myth that I wanted to address--one about foreign aid. I would like to move on to the last section in which I would like to talk about more philosophical, ethical boxes that we get trapped into, not just the informational boxes. Because, I really think that if the issue of needless hunger is fundamentally one of power, having to do with the distribution of economic power and the structures that maintain that, then it will not be changed by a new piece of legislation or by our fasting one day and sending contributions to a very effective development project--which, by the way, may be very appropriate actions to take. But the causes of needless hunger will not be challenged by those things. They will only--as I said in the beginning of my talk--be challenged as each of us grasp that every life choice we make--where we work, where we live, what we eat, where we shop, what we teach our children, all of these things, either shore up the status quo, the highly antidemocratic control in the economic sphere--either we shore that up, or we confront it by figuring out how, in each of these areas, we can create alternatives by taking more responsibility ourselves.

But, I think that people are unable to think of alternatives in the United States because they are trapped into certain simple boxes. I'd like to just point to three of them. In a way this discussion is an answer to the question, what is your vision? If you're so critical of the economic system as it exists today, in our country and many countries; then, what is your vision, I am often asked. The way that I answer this basic question is to say that I have no model in mind. There is no model. I don't limit my vision on what exists today in the world. But my hope would be to work toward living in a society that was at least asking the right questions; at least freed from the fear of change and engaged in the struggle of asking the right questions. To ask the right questions, we must get out of the boxes we are trapped in.

One of the boxes is that there is a conflict, a fundamental conflict between individual self-interests and community interests. In other words, people believe that if you talk about an alternative system, that you're a utopian; and, worse, you are essentially an authoritarian. Because people are basically selfish. So an alternative would mean forcing people to give up their self-interest which leads to a totalitarian state. And that is one trap.

To me, this is a false dichotomy. It's not an either/or. In other words, I think that in every society, in every person, there is a legitimate self-interest, and that it does not have to be extinguished in order to have a society in which basic needs are being met. It does not have to be extinguished. Rather, there is a fundamental tension between individual and community interest that has to be addressed and every society addresses it. In other words, the question from me is not, how do we extinguish individual self-interest and force people to work for

the social good only? Rather the question is how do we build social structures in which people can both act on their individual self-interest and serve the society's needs as well? In other words, how can we create structures in which more and more people can enjoy and have the right to feel useful? That is a right denied so many people in this society who are unemployed or employed in socially useless jobs. So I would throw out this simplistic individual versus community dichotomy and talk more in terms of those dynamic tensions that are not either/or.

The second box is the idea that any alternative would automatically limit individual freedom, and that our society is one in which we have individual freedom. When we think of alternatives we think only of having to give up individual freedom and people becoming gray automatons in a totalitarian state. Again I would say this is a simplistic box; every society limits individual freedom. It's not whether we limit individual freedom, it's how. In other words, in our society limits on the individual are placed primarily by income. The challenge, then--the right question to be asking--is, how can we place limits on the individual in a more democratic way? With the understanding that every society must place limits on individual freedom, how can this be done in a more conscious and democratic way, rather than just simply those who have the money having the freedom?

Third, and finally, is the simplistic idea, the box that people get trapped in, that planning is necessarily totalitarian. People believe that we don't have a planned system here; that countries like the Soviet Union do have a planned system; that planning is a top-down operation; that is, necessarily, people get ordered around.

Well, I would say that we do have planning in this system. Planning here is based primarily on the profit return to the private corporation. We do have planning; only that planning is in the interest of private entities and not in the public interest. So, again, the question is not whether planning, but how planning takes place, whether it can be made socially democratic.

To me these are the basic traps, the false "either/ors," that we have to get out of to discover that there is no ideal solution; there is no model that we can look to in some other country or here at home. We have to somehow develop the courage to take the risks to ask those fundamental questions.

I was once moved by an interview with I.F. Stone who was, many of you know, an early exposé of the root causes of the war in Viet Nam and produced his own newsletter. Once he was asked in an interview, "Mr. Stone, what is it that keeps you going? No one is really listening to you." I. F. Stone said, "Well, I see it this way, if you expect to see the final results of your work, you have just not asked a big enough question." So, I carry that challenge with me in my work.

I also know that if we are talking about changing systems, that means tremendous personal struggle. We individually will only come to believe that social change can take place if we experience it in our own lives. So, to me, the fundamental challenge of addressing the issue of needless hunger is addressing the question of whether we can change as individuals; whether we are willing to take risks; to put ourselves on the line; maybe to say things that are unpopular; to

do actions that take some effort. At the same time, we must make sure that we're telling people that we want them to join us, not to help carry our burden, but to help share the joy that comes in discovering meaningful action.

I would like to end with a paraphrase of a great man who captured in a much more eloquent way the themes I've tried to communicate today--the need for a long-haul commitment and the necessity of risk taking. What he says is this, "Nothing worth doing can be achieved in this lifetime, therefore we must be saved by hope. Nothing true or beautiful or good makes complete sense in the immediate context of history, therefore we must be saved by faith. Nothing worth doing can be accomplished alone, therefore we must be saved by love."

Energy and the Future

Barry Commoner

We will not solve our energy problems until and unless the people in this country recognize the profound ethical questions which have to be addressed if we are to solve them. Some of the ways in which we are dealing with our energy problems are misguided because of confusion about the ethical consequences of what we do. So, I'm really glad to be here. I think you're doing the country a service by raising the ethical questions that are related to the energy issue.

I don't need to tell you that there are ethical questions involved. We are confronted at the moment with a doctrine enunciated by Mr. Carter--the Carter Doctrine--which says that we will go to war if there is any interference with our access to oil in the Persian Gulf. Clearly, that's an ethical question. Is it correct, right, humane, to go to war over oil which belongs to somebody else?

There are other interesting ethical questions. Many of you have seen the response of the people who live around the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant to the ethical question of how to deal with the enormous amount of radiation resulting from the accident.

What I want to do is to try to delineate the relationships between energy and our ethical response so that you can be in a position to deal with your own constituency in raising these ethical questions. To do that I'm going to have to talk a little bit about energy. So, I'm going to give you a short course in energy and a short course in thermodynamics, but it'll be a very short course, about sixty seconds' worth. We might call it Thermodynamics .001 in the catalog. But I think it's essential, because one of my views of ethics is that most people lack the connection between what they believe and what they need to know to exercise their beliefs. I might tell you my own experience.

I've been in a lot of churches, not because I'm particularly God-fearing but because I'm interested in talking with people, and I think I was in almost every church in Saint Louis during the period when we were concerned about radiation from fallout from nuclear bomb tests. I had an experience

over and over again: I would explain what fallout was--that it wasn't the white stuff on your lawn (that was mold)--and that it was invisible and so on. And halfway through the talk someone, very often the minister, would say, "Oh, you mean we're poisoning our neighbors' wells." And at that point, the conscience, the moral view, the ethical view became clear: that one should not poison one's neighbors' wells. What was lacking was the understanding that fallout was doing exactly that. However, the moment the technical information was delivered in an understandable way, the link between the facts of life and morality was established. So my job is to present facts and then try to show how they relate to ethical decisions. I am not going to preach, however. You'll have to do that yourself.

Now, energy--what's energy all about? Why is it so important? Why is it worth going to war, perhaps, over energy? Well, if you look up energy in the physics book, you'll discover that everyone is in the same boat you're in, including the physicists--they don't know what it is. They know what it does. What it does is something called work, and if you look up work in the physics book, you'll be told it's a force exerted through a distance. That doesn't help explain the Carter Doctrine. So, I'm going to redefine the relationship between work and energy in a way which will relate them to the Carter Doctrine and to ethical questions.

First, I'll define "work" by giving you an accurate definition that will describe the second law of thermodynamics. Work is what you have to do if you want something to happen that won't happen by itself, for example, getting out of bed in the morning. Now you all have done the experiment just as I did this morning. I woke up and I did nothing, and I noticed that I did not get out of bed, which proves the process requires that work be done. Physicists will tell you getting out of bed is a nonspontaneous process and a nonspontaneous process is one that requires that work be done. Everything that you want to happen that will not happen by itself requires work.

For example, you want to build a house. Suppose I give you bricks, mortar, glass, wood, nails, and a chair, and you sit down and wait. There will be no house unless work is done. In fact, all the production of goods and services: building houses, making shoes, cars, shirts, sending telegrams, singing a song, all the things that don't happen by themselves require work.

Now to the point--there is no way to get work done other than to have available a source of energy that will allow energy to flow from one place to another; usually a hot place to a cold place. If you have the energy flow and are clever about it, you can do work. The work required to produce all goods and services is the source of all our economic wealth, which, in turn, is what we use or should use to support people's lives. You can see immediately then that if energy stops flowing, no work gets done, no goods are produced, the economic system grinds to a halt.

There was a time when the energy that we used was human energy, which comes from food. There was a time when we used animal energy. Now we use fuels. I can assure you that without a flow of energy, no work could

be done, no human needs could be met. It's not quite so simple because access to energy is itself a nonspontaneous work-requiring process. Suppose I want to demonstrate that it takes energy and work to get oil. Well, you can take a chair (that's just to be polite) and set it down over an oil field in Texas and do nothing. No oil will be produced. You now know that it takes work to get the oil out of the ground to where you want it. You have to drill the wells, you have to pump the oil, etc. So, in order to get the energy to make this whole thing go, we have to divert part of the wealth produced by the economic system back into the production of energy. This whole system is absolutely essential to our survival and everything that we do. Now what's gone wrong? The first thing that's gone wrong is that we have chosen to use a source of energy which, instead of supporting the economic system, is cannibalizing it. I'm talking about the fact that about ninety-five percent of the energy that we use in the United States comes from nonrenewable sources. That means oil, natural gas, coal, and uranium. As a result, our nearly total dependence on nonrenewable energy means that the cost of producing a unit of energy, a barrel of oil, a thousand cubic feet of natural gas, a pound of uranium oxide rises faster and faster as we use them up. Why? Because you always go after the cheapest source first. You take out the easiest barrel of oil first, which makes the next barrel more difficult to get, and the result is the cost goes up.

I'm going to draw a graph in the air. Here is a vertical axis which will be the cost of producing one barrel of oil from U. S. oil reserves in uninflated dollars, so we get inflation out of it. It goes up like this. Horizontally, I'm going to plot the total number of barrels of oil taken out of the ground in the United States, beginning in 1859 when we drilled the first well in Pennsylvania. In other words, the cost of production or the price at a fixed rate of profit--not the selling price--goes up exponentially. It goes up faster and faster as you take the oil out, because it becomes progressively more expensive to get it out of the ground. That one fact is behind the entire energy crisis, and unless you understand that relationship, you cannot make sense out of the energy crisis or the ethical issues that are involved.

You've heard that the energy crisis is that we're running out of oil. Mr. Carter made speeches in 1977 (waving a CIA report) saying the world is running out of oil. Absolutely true. It has been true since 1859, and Mr. Lincoln could have made the same speech with equal accuracy, because we've been running out of oil ever since we took the first barrel out. What else is new? The point is that we are so far along the oil use axis that our cost curve has gone way up. The real issue is that we are now progressively diverting more and more of the output of the economic system into the production of energy which means less is left to maintain our standard of living, to invest in social services or in new production. In other words, the rising cost of energy is eroding the very economic system that energy is supposed to support. That is what the energy crisis is about, and you know, I'm sure, from your own experience

what this has meant to ordinary people.

This year we voted, and Congress voted 1.3 billion dollars to see to it that several hundred thousand families in the United States could this winter pay their utility and heat bills and still have enough money left to buy food. The erosion of our wealth by the energy crisis has begun to drive people to the point where they haven't got enough to sustain the rest of their lives. And it has done the same thing to the economic system as a whole. It is very largely responsible for inflation which is eroding the standard of living. Now, I want to be sure that you are willing to accept this strange curve. I realize you believe that the OPEC nations raised the price of oil. Well, we'll get to that. But I want you to understand that this is built in to the physics of exploiting oil, and I want to give you a metaphorical way of thinking about it. I have a lot of metaphors to explain why the continued use of nonrenewable resources will inevitably result in escalating cost. I'll give you my Italian metaphor today, which has to do with food. Suppose I give you a bowl of spaghetti and tell you there are no seconds. That's now a nonrenewable resource. Right? And I want to ask, how much work will you have to do to eat the bowl of spaghetti? The work is required to lift the forkfull of spaghetti from the bowl to your mouth. It is also required to get the spaghetti on the fork. How do I know that? You put a fork next to spaghetti, and it will not wrap around by itself. Now, if we did the experiment, and I measured the work that you had to do to finish that bowl of spaghetti, I guarantee you if this is the amount of work you did per forkfull and this the number of forkfulls that you ate, the curve would go up like this. To demonstrate it very easily, think of the first and last forkfull of spaghetti. The first forkfull you get very easily. You go--scoop. You've got it. The last forkfull, you're scrambling around in the bottom of the bowl for quite a while to get the spaghetti on the fork. Why? Because the process of eating spaghetti changes the character of the bowl of spaghetti. You make the spaghetti in the bowl less accessible as you eat it. If you've got a nonrenewable resource which is easy to get in the beginning and hard to get at the end, I guarantee you the cost of getting it is going to go up. All right. If you're with me now, we can go ahead because that curve is absolutely essential to understand the energy crisis and to understand the myths about the energy crisis.

What is one myth? One myth is that energy has been priced too low. Haven't you heard that? And the reason why it has been priced too low is government regulations. Both of those are absolutely incorrect. How do I know that? Well, let's take the business of the price of oil in the United States. From about 1930, aside from the war years, to 1972, the price of oil in uninflated dollars domestic U.S. oil was absolutely constant. It was held constant. How? Who decreed that the price of oil should be constant? Well, I'll tell you exactly how it happened. It's all worked out in various histories of the energy situation in the United States. There's a book by John Blair which records the whole thing. Here's what happened. In the '20s and the

'30s when there were big discoveries of oil in Texas and Louisiana, a lot of oil was produced. So much oil was produced that it exceeded the demand. When that happens, the price falls. And, in fact, there were very serious fluctuations and depressions in the price of oil. And in the 1930s, the oil industry, particularly in Texas, was very concerned about the bad market for oil. And so the Texas oil producers took off one hat and put on another, which often converts a Texan from an oil man into a member of the state legislature. I'm sorry, there must be some Texans here, but it's more or less true, isn't it?

The Texas State Legislature--at the behest of the oil industry--passed a law which gave the Texas Railway Commission the right, the obligation, to govern the production of oil within the state of Texas, by setting monthly quotas on how much oil could be produced by each well. That quota was set according to a monthly report from the U.S. Bureau of Mines as to how much oil the country would need. So the production was restricted to exactly meet the demand. And any economist will tell you that at that point you can set the price where you want it and hold it there. That's how the price of oil was stabilized.

Now, do you suppose the oil industry stabilized the price below its cost? No. The price was stabilized well above the cost and held there because of this mechanism. Incidentally, federal laws were then passed to prevent what was called "hot oil"--oil surreptitiously produced above the quota in Texas and then shipped outside the state. The Connelly Hot Oil Act put the federal government behind this quota system which stabilized the price of oil. More recently, there have been federal price controls, but basically it was that. Now, that fact is very interesting because it explains the entire oil crisis and how OPEC got into the act.

I want to explain something to you. In 1971, the oil industry put out a report which had this graph that I've been describing to you printed in it. One way the graph showed the price of oil at a fixed rate of profit; another axis showed years, which is the same thing as the amount of oil produced. From 1950 to 1970, the historic price was constant. Then they said, "We predict that in order to maintain the present rate of profit, the American oil industry will have to sell its oil at a faster and faster rising price." And you now know why, because the curve was going up and you notice what they had done was to stabilize the price while the costs were rising. In 1971, there was a crunch. And they said, "Listen, we better break through this and start raising the price." And that's what the report said. I assure you it was read by every Arab oil minister, and they all went to business school, too. And in business school, you learn that if your best customers own oil, it's going to rise in price progressively, having been stable for twenty-five years. The best thing for you to do is to raise the price of your oil. And I can assure you that's why OPEC began to raise its price.

Sure, there was a war in 1973, and it was a good excuse. And if you look at the actual data, you discover that the price of U.S. oil has risen progressively along the

curve predicted by the U.S. oil industry. In other words, it is that fundamental relationship between cost and production of a nonrenewable resource which has resulted in the fact that OPEC can charge us a lot of money for oil that is produced cheaply.

Of course, the thing you must remember is we have the oldest oil fields in the world. That is, ours began in 1859. In the Midwest, they only begin in the 50s. Now, you have to ask the following question: "Why are we importing oil?" Well, I'll come back to that. But the basic reason is this: the U.S. oil companies in the mid-1950s began to discover that their profit margin was shrinking. And they predicted, for example, in the report I told you about that if nothing happened, in 1985, the rate of profit would be two percent, an intolerably low rate of profit. And so, in the mid-1950s, the U.S. oil industry began to shift abroad. In 1950, we imported fourteen percent of our oil. Today, it's about forty-five percent. That spread began to happen in the mid-1950s. And we now know why it happened. It happened because the U.S. oil industry discovered that it could make twice the profit abroad than it could on domestic operations. How do I know it? The president of Continental Oil gave a scientific paper to the Texas Geophysical Society around 1960 called "How to Become a Foreign Oil Company." And he told how to do it. He had a graph showing the profit was twice as high abroad as domestically, and therefore you go where the profit is higher. And one result was that the U.S. oil industry cut back by fifty percent its exploratory efforts in the United States. That is, the number of feet of exploratory wells dropped by fifty percent between 1955 and about 1960.

Now, there is an interesting law of physics which says that if you don't look for oil, you won't find any. And the result was that they didn't find so much. They were looking abroad, and they found it, and they sold it in the United States at a high price at a higher profit. These are simply fundamental facts which I don't think anyone has ever been able to deny.

Now, what's the issue? Well, there are two issues. One is, our economic system cannot continue to support the lives of the people of the United States without reducing their standard of living if the price of energy keeps rising. I am saying a very simple thing. The standard of living in the United States of the average American is now being eroded, reduced, by the rising cost of energy. Energy is absolutely essential. I'm not talking about the fuel used for snowmobiles. But you look at the dependence of workers, of middle income people, of poor people on energy and you discover that the poorer they are, the larger the dependence they have and the more they spend on energy. For example, if you divide the families of the United States into fifths with respect to income, you'll discover that the poorest fifth spends more than a quarter of their annual budget buying energy; the richest fifth, only five percent. As the price of energy goes up, it puts a heavier and heavier burden on poor people. They're using it for what? For heat. You can't live without heat in a cold climate. They're using it for washing clothes, washing dishes, driving to and from work. The energy is essential, therefore, to their lives and their liveli-

hoods. This is an intolerable situation which cannot continue. It will simply get worse and worse. There's nothing to stop this curve from going further up. The solution is that we have to go to a renewable source of energy.

Now, that's one source of our problem. Another source of our problem is that the technologies used to produce energy often clash with the interests of people. And, of course, the classical example is nuclear power. I want to say a little bit about that. Nuclear power is a way of producing electricity. Now there are many ways of producing electricity. For example, you can use coal, oil, natural gas; you can use sunlight.

Why is it that nuclear power has been so troublesome? No one has been that troubled by coal-burning power plants. And, I can assure you there have been accidents similar to the ones at Three Mile Island in coal-burning plants. You see, what happened there was that a valve got stuck; and, as a result, water in the circulating cooling system was spewed out of the system and various problems arose. Now, all power plants, whether nuclear or coal, or what have you, operate in essentially the same way. Water is boiled. The water becomes steamed. The steam runs an electric turbine, and that's how you get the electricity. So you have these circulating systems with water. Many valves have gotten stuck in coal-burning. But nobody ever has to invite the President to come and put on plastic booties and assure everybody that it's okay when there's an accident in a coal-burning plant, as he did at Three Mile Island.

What's the difference? The difference is this (and we'll go back to thermodynamics for a minute). Thermodynamics tells us that to use energy efficiently to do a work-requiring job, you must match the source of energy nicely to the job. Different jobs require different sources of energy. For example, getting out of bed in the morning, I myself use my muscular energy which comes from the food that I eat. Okay. I don't know what you do, but that's the way I do it. There are alternatives. My bedroom happens to be on the ground floor and has a door out to the garden. I could, if I want to, hire a small forklift truck and have it come in and put the prongs under my body and lift me out and dump me on the floor. I would call that an inappropriate source of energy for the task of getting out of bed. It's expensive, slightly. It might be damaging and so on.

Or suppose I give you a more obvious task: warming the baby's milk bottle. I've done it. You put a milk bottle in a pot of hot water; test it on your wrist; if it's fine, give it to the baby. Well, there are other ways of doing it. You could use a blow torch. Eventually, you'll get a warm bottle of milk. But I assure you that it'll be trouble. You'll have broken bottles, cut your fingers, milk will be spilled, and so on. It's an expensive way to do it.

All right. Back to nuclear power. What is the work-requiring task in a nuclear power plant? Boiling water. That is all that needs to be done. Obviously, there are alternative ways to boil water. The question is, is nuclear power an appropriate way to boil water? The answer is no. Now, how do we know it? Because most of the trouble

comes from the character of the energy used to boil the water--the fact that it is intensely damaging.

One of the most unethical things I know happening is the constant reiteration of a statement which is palpably false. As you know, at Three Mile Island they want to release some radioactive krypton so they can get access to the damaged reactor, and we are told it will be harmless. You've heard this. "There's been a release from Reactor X, but it was harmless." Now, I'll tell you, every increment in exposure to radiation carries with it a proportional increase in the risk to health. That is a dead fact. There is no way of avoiding it. Radiation is like a little bullet coming through the body, and it's bound to do some damage. There's no way of avoiding it. The more bullets you are exposed to, the higher the damage. Yes, it's true that the damage that may be expected from the release of krypton at Three Mile Island is equivalent to one-tenth of what you get from a chest X ray. But a chest X ray carries with it a risk of damage. You notice that the Cancer Society has just said, "Stop taking routine chest X rays." Because there is a certain amount of damage, and it is simply immoral to say there is none. The moral statement is, "Look, there is a problem." For example, running a nuclear power plant always involves some release of radiation. That release of radiation involves certain harm. The running of the nuclear power plant has certain benefits. It produces electricity. And what you need to consider is how much harm you are willing to sustain for the benefit of acquiring electricity. That is not a scientific question. There is no way of evaluating so many cases of cancer or so many genetic defects among children as against producing electricity at a given cost per kilowatt hour. I don't know any way of doing that. That's an ethical question. It's a religious question. It's a moral question.

The job that we have is to make sure that people see that moral issue, and the moment you say this release of radiation is harmless, what have you done? You have deprived people of their right of conscience. Literally, you have said that there is no issue of conscience here. We're telling you, "Scientifically, it's harmless." That is exactly like reeducating a person and diminishing their moral sensibility. It's taking away from them the grist of fact that has to be put in the mill of their conscience. I say that to you to give you a clear picture that you have to understand the facts in order to see what the ethical issue is, and it's very easy sometimes to obscure the ethical issue by a spurious presentation of the facts. The issue in nuclear power is simply this. How important is it as a source of producing electricity as compared to the damage? People have to decide for themselves.

Well, let me turn now to what to do about it. If the basic issue is the nonrenewability of the sources of energy which are escalating the cost and eroding the standard of living, then clearly what we have to do is to have a transition to renewable energy. Incidentally, the present nuclear power system is not renewable. The uranium fuel will run out in twenty-five to thirty years. Let no one tell you that it is necessary in

order to provide our energy future. That's nonsense.

There is a type of reactor, a breeder reactor, which will extend the usefulness of the fuel for two thousand years, true. The one we built outside Detroit nearly melted down. And it is very difficult to control, and, in any case, even the most avid proponent of nuclear power will agree that a breeder cannot be put in place in less than twenty-five years in the United States. We can't stand the rising cost of energy for twenty-five years. The economy, the country will be wrecked well before that if we don't shift to stably priced energy. So, the only answer really is solar energy. I want to say a little bit about it. You understand that the spaghetti problem does not occur in the sun. You can use all the sunlight you want, and you will not deplete the sun. It will go on putting out energy just the way it was meant to, whether you use it or not. That's why it's renewable. The spaghetti phenomenon that I described doesn't occur with the sun--it is impervious to our activity. So, that means that as long as you can capture sunlight, its cost will remain constant forever. But to capture it, you have to do certain things.

Now, I know you've heard this is pie in the sky, something in the year 2000, etcetera. That's nonsense, too. And I'll make a flat statement which I've made often, and it has never been contradicted. All of the basic essential and sensible sources of solar energy are now technically feasible and are either economic or can be made economic by simple administrative measures. The only thing that stands in the way is politics.

For example, there are simple ways of collecting heat and using it to warm a house and produce hot water. Okay? There have been numerous studies now that show that in most of the United States it is economically sound. It's a very simple device, incidentally. It's a box painted black inside with a glass lid, and it gets hot in the sun. You put cold air in one end and hot air comes out the other.

I have a little slogan for you: "It's entirely possible to be in favor of solar energy and stupid at the same time." You have to understand it. For example, solar panels were installed by a utility in a study in New England, and half of them didn't work. Why? Because the pumps (which had water going through them) were installed backwards.

However, this is a technology which can work. What's the problem? Well, the problem is that for a typical one-family house, you'll need to spend \$20,000 to \$25,000 to buy the equipment. But it would pay you. If you went to the bank and added that to your mortgage and paid a constant rate of interest and amortized it over fifteen to twenty years as compared with the escalating cost of electricity for conventional heat, this flat mortgage will be economical. You'll save money. It's a good deal. But suppose you're renting a house, and you don't have a mortgage? How are you going to get solar energy? Suppose you can't afford a \$25,000 addition to your mortgage? Then you're stuck. The consequence of that is that the present method of introducing solar collectors (which is what these things are called) is hurting exactly the people who suffer most from the energy crisis--the poor. I say that to you flatly.

Let me give you an example. I came to California a few years ago, and my ecological friend said, "Hallelujah, great things have happened in California. Jerry Brown and the legislature have given us a new bill, a new law, that gives a fifty-five percent tax rebate on solar equipment." Great! We have now encouraged the entry of solar energy into California. I just saw the last report on the results of that. Seventy-two percent of the rebates were given to people who installed solar heaters for their swimming pools. What does that mean? It means that the poor of California were supporting the rich. That's Robin Hood in reverse. It's worse than that. Suppose that the rich who can afford \$25,000 investments see the value of it, and, rapidly many of them put solar heaters on their house, not only swimming pools, and a lot of solar energy is introduced into a utility district where most people use electricity to heat their homes. You know what happens? The cost of electricity rises, and the poor people who can't afford to do it will now be paying more for their electricity because the rich people are paying less for their heat. Incidentally, the present laws for inducing the introduction of solar energy federally are exactly the same. They are financial incentives.

And what I tell you is another slogan: "It's entirely possible to be politically reactionary and retrogressive and in favor of solar energy at the same time." And there are ecologists who will say, "We must raise the price of conventional energy in order to encourage people to go solar." Yes, you'll encourage the rich and put a burden on the poor.

There's an ethical question for you. You notice that to deal with the ethical question, you've got to penetrate into the facts, and I've seen many good-willed people say, "Solar energy is good; it's natural; it fits with my pantheistic notions or theistic notions, or what have you. It has the right ethical feel to me." See? And it is ethical, therefore, to develop solar energy. By the way, we're going to have to raise the price of energy to do it, and the poor will suffer, but these people will say, "All right, I understand that. What we'll do is give them special welfare support to make up for it." That, too, is a burden on the poor.

Imagine--you force citizens, who happen to be poor, to depend on a subsidy because you have worked out a mechanism for using solar energy in a way that helps the rich! Now, I think that's an emotional burden that people shouldn't be asked to carry, and also there's a lot of slippage.

When I close, I want to say something about politics. Let me say something about it right now. Mr. Anderson is an honest man of ideas, and he's highly praised for having ideas, and I think it's good to have ideas. But the ideas should be good ones. Mr. Anderson is very proud that he has this idea of raising the price of gasoline with a fifty cent tax, and he is sensitive--he is an honest man--sensitive to the fact that this will put a burden on the poor. He said we're going to compensate by cutting the Social Security tax. Great. But you know there are slippages. There's such a thing as cash flow, and people, the poor people, then will be trying to balance the high cost

of their gasoline with maybe their getting a check that cuts their Social Security. Why should they be given that cash flow profit to solve a national issue? It would be better to have the rich worry about it than the poor.

So, what I'm saying is there is this introduction of solar energy that has in it the same moral dilemmas, the same moral problems, as the introduction of nuclear power. It is not a, so to speak, born ethical form of using energy. The sun is not born good. In fact, Mr. Carter did something I thought was impossible. And that was to turn solar energy into a belligerent weapon. You know what he did when he announced the embargo on Soviet corn? He rescued himself from the wrath of the farmers by saying, "We're going to use a lot of that corn to produce solar energy in the form of alcohol made from the corn." So you see you can use solar energy for what I would call pernicious aims. That's a political judgment.

Let me give you one or two other examples and then stop. If you talk to an engineer about solar energy, he'd say, "Well, heating a house--that's easy. How about getting electricity? You know--we need it." Well, there is a way of getting electricity very directly from the sun using a gadget called a photovoltaic cell. It's a slice of a crystal of silicone properly treated and you throw sunlight on it, and it produces electricity. Everytime you look at a satellite television program it's powered by photovoltaic cells up in the satellites. You can buy a wristwatch for \$32.00 that is powered by a little photovoltaic cell. But what's the trouble? The trouble is, it's too expensive. It would cost \$1,000 to run a hundred-watt bulb. You would have to buy \$1,000 worth of photovoltaic cells.

Well, a few years ago, Congress asked the Federal Energy Administration to work out ways of making such things economical, and they worked out a very interesting way. You see, it turns out that the industry that builds these things is the same industry that makes the integrated computer chips that now are in television games and computers. Those chips were invented in the '50s. In 1960, they were wholly produced for the military. They went into missiles, for example. And the price was \$50 a chip. But the Department of Defense ordered so many of these things--as you know, we spent a lot of money on missiles and so on--that the industry expanded, automated, and in six years the price was down to \$2.50; and then it became economical for civilian applications. That's what's giving us the big burst of cheap computers that we now have. In other words, the government invested in creating a new economical industry.

Well, the FEA looked into that with respect to photovoltaic cells, and they discovered that if the industry was given an order of about half a billion dollars for photovoltaic cells, it would bring the price down to \$3.00 or \$4.00 in the first year, \$1.00 a watt in the second year from \$10.50 in the fifth year. Now at \$3.00 to \$4.00 a watt, it would pay to use photovoltaic cells in Third World countries instead of centrally operated power plants. That's why the UN has offered an open contract for millions of watts of photovoltaic cells at \$3.00 a watt. At \$1.00 a watt, it becomes economical, in-

cluding the cost of the batteries. (You know the sun goes down every night so you have to store the electricity.) Including the cost of the batteries at \$1.00 a watt, it's economical for lighting a parking lot or road lighting. And at fifty cents a watt, it becomes economical in the Southwest United States and thereafter in the rest of the country.

Why haven't we done it? Congress voted a ninety-eight million dollar appropriation to do it. Mr. Carter vetoed it last April. Now the reason why he vetoed it is that the moment you introduce solar energy, it makes the consumer a producer. Why? You want photovoltaic electricity, you put the gadgets on your own roof, and you don't get involved with the utility. You want heat, you put a solar collector on your own roof, and you're not involved with buying fuel. In other words, this is a vast change in the economics of the energy system.

We now have an economy in which energy is provided by huge energy corporations: the oil industry, the utility industry--provided everyone else is a consumer. Solar energy works in a decentralized way, making the consumers their own producers--a vast change in the economics of the system.

This brings me to what I regard as the most serious ethical issue which pervades the entire energy issue. Let me just review for you very briefly some of the things I've said and show you where it is. The oil crisis has hurt the country. No question about it--it has hurt not only consumers, it has hurt business. Last week there was a Commerce Department report which reported that the profits in the last quarter for American business went down, with the exception of the oil industry which went up, because most businesses are suffering from the high price of oil. But for the reasons I have explained to you, the U.S. oil industry is making big profits--mostly out of its foreign investments.

How did we get into this mess? Who decided to import oil? Did we have a congressional hearing on it? Did we have a presidential commission? Were you asked? No. The decision was made by the U.S. oil corporations autonomously against one criteria--increasing their profit; and you have to recognize a very serious moral issue. Does a corporation have a right to enhance its own interests, its own profitability, at the expense of the interests of the nation and of the people of the nation? That's a pervasive question. Why did the utilities build nuclear power plants? I'll tell you why. The nuclear power program was not set up as an energy program. It was set up as a political program by Mr. Eisenhower when he realized that people were worried about nuclear bombs, and he proposed an Atoms for Peace program to show people that there were useful, peaceful ways of making use of nuclear energy. Some of them were ridiculous.

One of the AEC people came to Saint Louis, and said that they were ready to remove an island in the Mississippi River that was an obstruction to navigation by blowing it up with an atomic bomb. That is literally true. We didn't do it. The one thing that did work was the nuclear power program. That's when it was introduced, and the utility executives were brought in and the government didn't say to them, "Listen, the President wants to put this peaceful place on nuclear

weapons. Won't you help us"? That's not what they were told. They were given a message in terms they understood--money. They were told literally that nuclear power would be so cheap that they wouldn't bother to meter it, and as a result, they could fire all their meter readers, and their profits would go up. That's literally what they were told. It turned out to be a technical mistake. It doesn't work that way. So, what I'm saying is, the reason why we got into this nuclear power mess is, again, that the utilities had a single criterion for deciding what to do--profitability.

Why do we have gas guzzlers, which, incidentally, not only reduced mileage and caused smog--that's the cause of smog, the big cars--but have also wrecked the auto industry? We now have all over the country auto plants being abandoned--disrupting whole communities because they're building the wrong kinds of cars. The reason is, and it has now been admitted by the auto industry, that big cars make more profit than small cars; and after World War II, the auto companies deliberately increased the size of the cars to make more profit. Did it hurt the country? You bet.

So, I am raising a very fundamental issue. It's an ethical issue. Is it right for the owners of capital to use it in ways that benefit the holders of the capital even though it hurts the country? Now, this is a radical question, but you understand that this is the way in which corporations work.

I give you evidence of it from Mr. Swearingen who was on television recently and gave an interview--he's president of Standard Oil of Indiana--with the Chicago Tribune, and he said, "We are not in the energy business--Standard Oil of Indiana. We are in the business of producing the best return on the investment that we can for our stockholders." In fact, if he didn't say that, he could be sued.

So, I'm raising a basic issue now, which is: have we hurt the country by the energy crisis, the waste of gasoline, the fact that we're not rebuilding the railroads because no corporation finds them profitable to run although the country needs them just as much as every European country does, which has vastly better railroads than we do? Now, is it right for chemical companies to make a lot of money and dump carcinogenic chemicals into the water supply just for their profit? I think this is a very basic issue, and I want to make one final statement. I think this ethical issue is the issue that is going to dominate the life of the country in the next decade. Why? Because this has now begun to affect the livelihood of the country. The steel industry is now closing plants because they are not profitable. U.S. Steel Corporation has closed sixteen plants--very wisely from their point of view--because most of their profits now come from their chemical investments. In other words, what is happening is that the corporate interest in profit is now causing them to switch to things that are different. Mobile bought Montgomery Ward. We needed to produce oil. You've seen in recent days many industries going abroad--the textile industry, the electronics industry--building plants abroad because they make a better profit there.

In other words, in a sense, the country is becoming disindustrialized. We are los-

ing our railroads. Our auto industry is now rapidly becoming inferior to the German and Japanese industries; and, the energy industry is driving us to the wall economically. I'm saying that this is going to be an issue that will touch everyone.

In November, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Paul Volcker made a statement that Newsweek called the most important political statement of the decade because nobody answered it. He said there's no way of dealing with our economic problems short of reducing the standard of living of the average American--for the reasons I've just given you. We can reverse that and do things that will enhance the economy, rebuild the railroads, produce solar energy, produce the right kind of cars, rebuild the obsolete plants when a union wants to buy the plant and run it. We can do that, if we begin to govern these decisions by the national interest rather than the private interest of the corporation.

My own position, and I'm wearing a blue button that says "Citizens Party," because that's a new political party that's going to introduce this issue into the 1980 campaign--my own position is clearcut. I've made my ethical choice. I am in favor of a choice which favors people over profits--as simply as that. But I don't want even to persuade you to join me, although we would love to have you join the Citizens Party. This is more important. What is more important is that this issue be discussed, that it become clear to the people of this country that there is a profound ethical issue that the country has to face, and what is wrong with the political campaign so far is that that ethical issue hasn't even been whispered about. And the real reason why we've created the Citizens Party is we believe this ethical issue has got to be brought back into political life.

I'll close by reminding you of a similar historic period: the period before the Civil War. If you look at your history books, you'll notice that all of the election campaigns before 1860 were regarded by historians as what they call the Ignominious Period of American history. That's the period in which all the presidents who were elected were nonentities chosen to be nonentities. Buchanan, who preceded Lincoln, was regarded as the prize candidate because he had been in England as ambassador so long that he had no interest in slavery. That was the ethical political issue before the people--slavery--and the two main political parties--the Whigs and the Democrats--were so fearful of losing votes if that issue were discussed that they deliberately conspired to avoid discussing the issue in the campaigns. That's why you don't remember the names of the presidents who were elected then. The time has come to face this pervasive ethical political issue. The issue is: Is the country going to be run under the direction of the big corporations or the people of this country?

Southern Baptists Facing the Issues of the Eighties

Albert McClellan

A good way to study the future is to review the past. In doing this, one discovers that the future indeed will be different and that from one decade to another the changes will be subtle and often radical. In the long term, major movements may become less important or even disappear, and minor movements may grow more important and even dominant. Three examples of such changes are what happened to automobiles, electronic communications, and business machines over a sixty-year period, 1920-1980.

The Automobile

1920s	status
1930s	convenience
1940s	necessity
1950s	mobility and recreation
1960s	two-car families
1970s	car as economy keystone

Electronic Communications

1920s	radio as novelty
1930s	radio as entertainment
1940s	radio as information
1950s	TV as entertainment
1960s	TV as influence
1970s	TV as life changer

Business Machines

1920s	adding machine and comptometer
1930s	bookkeeping machine
1940s	discovery of cybernetic principles
1950s	vacuum tube computers and discovery of transistors
1960s	miniaturization of computers and their widespread use in business and industry
1970s	universal use of computer in business and industry and beginning use in homes

Most of us are aware of the constantly changing influence of these trends on the life of the churches, but we are not sure of their continuing influence in the years to come. For example, Lyle E. Schaller,¹ one of the best known church futurists, pushes our imagination to its limits. He says that in the 1980s electronics will have even more specific presence in the churches. He gives five examples.

1. Hand held teaching machines.
2. Two-way interactive television.
3. Minicomputer management of membership records.
4. Use of electronic devices in ministry to the handicapped.
5. Denominational supply of hardware and software to the churches.

Dr. Schaller is technologically oriented. He is also an optimistic person. To read his predictions in these frenzied times at best requires tongue in cheek agreement. If one assumes that electronic business machines make the churches better, one will

agree with him. But do they? Do they really meet moral and spiritual needs? These are incidental questions to which there are good answers from both points of view. A more vital question for now is that given our pre-world circumstances, is any optimism possible? Not many people seem to think it is, at least not for world problems.

Even the newscasters are discouraged. Gloom settles around us every time television news appears. John Chancellor has been known to begin his review with the words, "Bad news tonight!" Most of the time he does not need to announce it. The bad news is just there in what he selects to say. His definition of what is news and his selection of what he thinks is important is an editorial judgment of the future.

But not all newsmen are so pessimistic. One voice of reasonable optimism is James Reston. His spirit was pinpointed in something he said to a TV interviewer after his trip to China when he had emergency surgery for appendicitis by Chinese doctors using acupuncture. This was early in the talks between the United States and China and before restoration of diplomatic relations between them. The interviewer asked Reston if in the midst of his ordeal and the touchy situation with China he had any hope whatever. He replied that in the face of such difficulties he fell back on his Calvinistic rearing in which he had learned that even the most hopeless situation carries within it the seeds of redemption.

This statement of Reston's is basically a Christian idea, and it should set the mood for any Christian who seriously looks at our nervous and schizophrenic world. People who try to understand the future need to be aware of the redemptive possibilities inherent within our worst problems. Jesus, I would remind you, was always taking a bad situation and making something good out of it. With this as our mood, let us now examine some of the problems possible for the 1980s. I state these problems as possibilities, not inevitabilities, and with best and worst sides, because like Reston, I believe that even the worst of situations has possibilities for good.

1. Energy may be a controlling issue. At worst, the world could fight a massive global nuclear war over the sources of energy. Just as men in the past have fought over land and water, other men could fight over oil and coal. At best, man will learn how to economically share and use energy already available, or some new abundant miracle energy could be discovered.

2. Inflation may not slow down until the energy problem is solved. For example, one prediction is that gasoline will be \$2 a gallon by the end of this year, and \$10 a gallon by the end of this decade. At worst, the economy could be totally destroyed by the energy and inflation problems. At best, wise men will find ways to bring back inflation to the six or seven percent level.

3. Housing may become critical. This could happen as building materials become scarcer, as the baby boom matures and enters the housing market, and as prices rise. At worst, the housing market could come to a complete standstill. At best, America could impose a strict discipline on herself and keep the use of resources in line. Also at best, Americans could be brought closer together with more efficient land use and bet-

ter housing arrangements. There could even be a better interclass community matrix and a more unifying community texture.

4. Citizenship may be more difficult. The national political stability could be further disrupted with increased lobbying, further coalescence of ethnic minorities, destruction of the tax base, and bankrupted municipalities. At worst, we could drift into a fascist society as a terrible grasp for social control. At best, a new sense of moral responsibility could revive America's political stewardship. There are signs of growing reaction to graft, dishonesty, incredibility, and pork-barrelling in public office.

5. Vast discontinuities may develop between rich and poor, educated and uneducated, protected labor unions and unprotected white collar workers, home owners and renters, employed and unemployed, blacks and hispanics, ethnic coalitions and the unorganized majority, and many other social opposites. At worst, growing schism could force the nation into a totalitarian situation, perhaps even civil insurrection. At best, there could come a rising sense of interpersonal responsibility, and a new rapprochement of opposites.

6. Education at all levels may become a major issue. A shaky tax structure, sectarian exclusiveness, deteriorating discipline, labor union demands, transportation costs, building costs, questionable educational goals, and academic freedom are some of the trouble points. At worst, free public education as we have known it could be destroyed. Higher education could become so expensive as to be a luxury. Even the churches could be radically divided. Lyle Schaller has pointed out that "abortion" may have been the church issue of the 1970s, but that in the 1980s it will be education with "choosing up of sides among church leaders over the issue of the future of the public schools."² Also at worst, the public schools could be destroyed in an avalanche of expensive private schools. At best, new and resourceful ways will be found to provide parity in education, and education will emerge again as high priority on both the local and national scenes.

7. Freedom may become a vital issue in the 1980s. Emphasis is almost certain to be placed on freedom from prejudice, freedom from tradition, and freedom from too much government. America will closely examine many of the new tyrannies: the tyranny of franchise, the tyranny of manipulative television, and the tyranny of an indiscriminating and impersonal press. At worst, liberty will become even more licensed and will diminish as Americans develop a defensive fascist mentality. At best, liberty in America will more than ever rest on an authentic theological and spiritual base.

8. Government itself may become the dominant social issue in the 1980s: Too much government, bankrupt government, runaway government, corrupt government, or ineffective government. At worst, we could be driven to the brink of anarchy. At best, debate could strengthen traditional government for services it must perform for our increasingly pluralistic society.

9. Personal fulfillment in a low-energy society could be highly traumatic. At worst, we could end in economic and social bankruptcy. At best, America could vastly

reorganize her transportation, communication, and housing resources to meet all human need and provide a better quality of life for her citizens.

10. The national character may be challenged and changed. Increasing alcoholism and drug addiction could lower the nation's IQ among youth and make us vulnerable to aggressor nations. At worst, America could collapse both physically and spiritually. At best, this prospect could bring new personal discipline and societal control to correct our present highly licensed situation.

This brief outline of extremes possible for the 1980s is meant only to be illustrative. It could be multiplied many times by other issues as important as any of these ten. One thing is fairly certain, public issues like those listed here will have direct bearing on the life and work of Baptist churches. Of course, no person can write the Baptist headlines of the future, but it seems clear that whatever affects the public sector also affects the Baptist sector. It seems clear also, at least to me, that there is a good Baptist future, though it surely will be different from our good Baptist past. My personal picture of the Baptist future is both hopeful and drastic.

1. The life and character of the local church will likely improve. If the energy problem is as serious as some say, the churches will be radically changed. If not, they still will change. Probably there is an energy problem, but in the long run it may not be as disastrous as some now think it is. Also, the problem is not as non-existent as others think. The economic changes related to the energy problem will be the determining factors in short-term future church life, especially as personal mobility is diminished. It is more hopeful for the long-term future.

Karl Rahner once wrote that there will always be the "little flocks," small groups of believers in out-of-the-way places. Is this a prophecy of retreat? Surely there will be little flocks, but not necessarily in retreat or defeat, rather as the way the church will address the new times. Just as medieval cathedrals are relics of the past, some of the church programs, and even some of the church structures of today could become outmoded and unusable, especially if energy supplies are greatly diminished.

In huge metropolitan areas where population is highly concentrated there may be some temporary increase in "house" churches. Some will remain in one location for relatively long periods of time, others will be peripatetic, wandering from house to house. Some of these churches will be fluid in membership and organization. They will exist as house churches only as long as the economy prohibits them from owning their own buildings or at least owning partnership in buildings. To really grow the churches will always need at least semi-permanent domiciles. These domiciles will determine in some ways the nature of Christian education.

Lyle Schaller³ believes that in 1985-90 there will be a revival of church building. He gives five reasons:

- (1) Catch up from a ten-year lag.
- (2) Babies born after World War II will come into leadership and money.
- (3) New architecture.
- (4) Dispersion of people into new com-

munities.

(5) A coming religious revival.

Though still institutional in character, the churches of tomorrow may be smaller and less tied to huge energy demanding buildings. There will be buildings but they will be re-designed to be less formal and to be better arranged to foster koinonia. A new evangelism based on group solidarity will emerge. The Church will worship as it does now. The sermon will be more important, and in the process increasingly didactic. It will become again a major means of instructing the faithful. Preaching will be shared, with both ordained and unordained participating, women as well as men; but there will always be the pastor who will be the leader of the flock.

Churches may need to share buildings, and buildings may be used continuously, especially on the days of worship, with groups attending at different hours. The churches will foster programs paid for by tithes and offerings, but there will be increased awareness of the need for personal ministry in locally fostered social action and mission action projects.

Even the smallest church of the future must be organized and administered. It must be promoted, and above all it must be led. A church without strong leadership will weaken and fade. Local church leadership must have both a sense of mission and a feeling for organization, and it must see both as spiritual tasks.

There appears now to be less emphasis on uniformity even in the largest and oldest and most tradition-bound denominations. It may become less and less possible to have a national uniform program of any kind. It will not be possible for denominational agencies to offer unified services for a diversity of people. This does not mean there will be less services, only less uniformity. Groups of similar conviction will coalesce. Their unity will likely be one of mission, not necessarily one of method.

If energy continues to be a serious problem, some churches will meet seasonably, especially those located in the harsher climatic areas. Diminished energy will possibly bring some blessings to the churches. With travel greatly reduced, people may find they have more time for church. The church fellowship may again become the members' chief social opportunity. Families may become stronger, and if this happens, the churches will decidedly improve.

2. Use of time and people in the local church will be rearranged. There is nothing biblical about the eleven o'clock hour except that it is on the Lord's day. Many churches now are finding other more suitable hours for worship. For many, 11:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. may still be the most convenient times. If American churches were beginning anew, many perhaps would select these as the best hours.

The important thing that will be considered in setting worship times is the purpose of the gathering of the church. Why does it meet? What does it do at the gathering? If worship, evangelism, Bible study, and koinonia are important, then the church should gather as often as there is need for these. Churches that gather often seem to thrive, and those that do not languish and die. In New Testament times the strongest churches appeared to meet daily. In today's time the

strongest churches meet at least three times weekly. The future should bring no change in this, except that energy problems may mean some adjustment in the distance people drive to church and the number of times the churches meet.

As churches grow more numerous and closer to the social life of the people, the members could even become more active. Fifty years ago people were walking two or three miles to church two or three times weekly. Fifty years from now they could do the same, if necessary.

3. Religious education will be much more important. One cannot read the Bible without becoming aware of the role of teaching and studying in the life of the church. The early churches thrived on what they learned of the gospel. This tradition was continued among the church fathers, and progress made through the third century was largely due to the way in which the churches learned the fundamentals of the Judeo-Christian faith.

The true churches of tomorrow will not be any less well learned. Compared with today there may be some differences. Preaching will become more didactic and hortatory. As preachers see more the ruin of materialism, they will emphasize Christian values and will be fired with a new desperate unction. The Bible more than ever will be the central textbook of the churches. Bible classes will develop wherever people gather for work or for social activities. Unless there is a disastrous lack of energy, the Sunday Schools will continue to exist.

Parents are restive over the lack of true Christian education for children in some of the church schools. Following the lead of secular educators, some local leaders have substituted the impressionistic casual learning methods for traditional methods that emphasize biblical content. The absence of concrete biblical material is of great concern to many parents. This is likely to change as Christian educators sense this newly felt need. There will be increased use of the Bible in the instruction even of the very young.

4. The role of the home in spiritual formation will be greatly emphasized. For a great many people the home and the family are becoming more important than ever in the religious education of children and youth. Among older parents today there is widespread feeling that the churches have faltered in the inculcation of Christian truth in children and youth. It possibly will not mean less involvement in church activities, but more awareness of parental responsibility for teaching Christian knowledge and values. In the years to come Christians may turn more to the Old Testament for guidance in religious educational methodology. They may learn methods from others, particularly from the Jewish tradition.

As churches become aware of the place of the home in religious education they will (1) seek to create an even deeper consciousness among parents of parental responsibility, (2) take steps to improve church educational programs, and (3) provide materials to help parents in the home do better work in the teaching of youth.

Somewhere, sometime the pastoral ministry will become more consciously educative. The pastor will become as much an educator as a preacher. He will teach and he will equip others to teach.

5. Evangelism in the churches of tomorrow will be koinonia oriented. Truly, if the church survives it will do a better job in evangelism, and to do it there will likely be changes. (1) Church members will become more highly disciplined. (2) Evangelism will find power in the spiritual fellowship of the church. (3) More than ever the teaching of the Bible will become the open door of evangelism. Group Bible study will be one of the most widely used evangelistic methods. It will not replace preaching, but will become an even more important adjunct to preaching. (4) Personal witness of one individual to another will continue and possibly increase. (5) There will be some change in preaching, becoming less histrionic and more didactic, and less contrived and more filled with the Spirit. This will lead to a new sense of urgency and earnestness. There will be a new yearning in preaching, manifest not in shouting but in unctious, not in words but in communication. Radio and TV evangelism will continue in importance as a means for communicating the gospel, yet if it is effective it must find new credibility.

6. The responsibility of the laity in the church will be magnified. Ever since the appearance of Theology of the Laity by Hendrick Kraemer, American Protestants have done much talking about lay ministry and a little striving to effect it. So far, the movement has languished, perhaps succeeding only here and there, but in the main outrightly failing. The emerging laity has never quite emerged.

Church members generally are good neighbors. They serve their own congregational koinonia well and they extend friendly hands to their neighbors, but in the main, they do not minister to the world. Even in the koinonia they seldom engage in preventative ministry, only in crisis ministry, and that not too fervently.

This may change, due partly to all the talk of the past two decades and partly to a new understanding of the pastor as equipper. If this happens we can expect: (1) a new appreciation of what it means to be a Christian in the world, (2) a reorientation of church programs toward people in distress in the community, (3) a new tenderness in the church, with members more conscious of one another's burdens and more inclined to bear one another's burdens, (4) an increased discipline in the church with more individuals more willing to submit to it, (5) better understanding by the laity of the role of the minister in the congregation, (6) a consequent restatement of the image of the ministry with clear lines drawn between types of ministries, and (7) a wide acceptance of the bivocational minister.

I have made the point that public consciousness impacts the churches. To what extent do the churches impact the public? One answer is to look at the impact of the last decade and to ask how the impact of the next decade will differ.

The Impact of the 1970s

1. The electronic church. What they see on television and hear on radio is about all some people know of the local church. While some of these programs are effective, many are not. They appeal mostly to Christians who themselves are not involved in local churches. Many of the independent national programs are very poor show windows for true

Christianity and sometimes their sponsors degenerate into money raising shills. One suspects that their general public impact for good is either negative or nil. Of different character are the denominationally sponsored programs. These generally--though not invariably--are responsible and oriented to local church needs. Included in these are 4,334 half-hour radio programs and 13 hours of network TV produced by the SBC Radio and Television Commission. Also included are the 39 half-hour TV programs ("At Home with the Bible") sponsored by the SBC Sunday School Board and produced by the Radio and Television Commission. Also different are the programs sponsored by Southern Baptist local churches. These include 3,264 radio programs and 75 TV programs. While these may not be technically the most efficient, they are at least locally creditable, hopefully to unbelievers as well as believers. At least the Southern Baptist "electronic church" (1) compares favorably in size with the independent "electronic churches," (2) does not shill the public in order to stay on the air, (3) is genuinely tied to the local churches, and (4) has an authentic worldwide base, not 60 missionaries in 60 countries as one group claims, but 3,000 missionaries in 94 countries. Yet to be perfectly honest we still must ask, "Has church use of the media really created a favorable response by the general public?" Perhaps it has, but there are many who feel it has not.

2. The "born again" image. Two people are probably responsible for the widespread public interest in this honored New Testament phrase, Jimmy Carter and Charles Colson; and both, it should be noted simply, said it as their personal religious experience, and that it was the media that magnified it. In some cases the impact has been positive, and in some negative. The widespread wrong use of the term indicates that for many the true meaning has been lost. The transfer to other actions such as the "Born Again Disco" has cheapened public appreciation of the concept.

Nevertheless, the impact is clearly a part of the new consciousness of America, and will have positive bearing on our future.

3. The lay renewal movement. The lay renewal movement has touched churches of all denominations. For many it has been accompanied with a resurgence of fundamentalism and even tongue speaking. Some of this impact has been wholesome, and some negative. The good has been the quickening of the churches, and the bad has been the fragmentation of the churches. Some of it has been accompanied with strong legalism and at times even judgmental puritanism.

4. Religious liberty. The impact of the churches for religious liberty has been largely passive, and what they did, they did as heirs of the religious liberty battles of the past. However, there has been some positive action against the encroachment on the rights of churches and of persons. At least by the end of the decade the government had not significantly financed private schools.

5. Morals. The impact of the churches for morals is very difficult to assess. During the decade liquor consumption increased, the divorce rate went up, traditional sex values lost ground, pornography became licensed, profanity and low raw burlesque captured the theater and TV screens,

and situational ethics distorted biblical ethics; yet by the end of the decade--and perhaps because of what happened in it--many of the churches began to show higher ethical awareness. They were slow to respond to the new challenges, but it seems likely now that their response is slowly building to maturity for action in the decade to come. I sincerely hope this is not wishful thinking.

6. Education. The impact of the churches on education calls for mixed analysis. Since 1970 private school enrollment has increased 60 percent to 1.8 million. Public school enrollment has fallen two million. A great many of the new private schools are church schools. One of the largest in America is a Southern Baptist school in Memphis, only seven years old. One view is that these schools are searching for quality education; another view is that they are white flight. We must ask what does fragmentation of American education do for American unity? Does it further worsen our divisive pluralism? Does it forebode the 1980s? What will be the role of the churches in the stabilization of the educational picture? A serious question for Baptists is, does the present emphasis on church sponsored schools abandon traditional Baptist involvement in the public community and Baptist determination for the gospel's sake not to colonize?

The Impact of Baptists in the 1980s

In the decade of the 1970s the churches did not grow significantly. In some cases they lost ground. Their enemies occasionally openly attacked them, even to the point of abuse, though this was nothing remotely resembling persecution, at least not in America. Groups such as the Unification Church greatly embarrassed traditional churches. The "organized" church was subjected to critical analysis and abuse at times, sometimes by their own members, sometimes by outsiders. This tended to influence public acceptance of the churches. Never wholly accepted by the non-church public, the churches probably were less accepted at the end of the 1970s than at the beginning, yet probably they were in fact no less influential. Diminished popularity did not necessarily bring diminished influence, though perhaps the battle lines were more clearly drawn and the extremes more prominently seen.

In the decade of the 1980s there should be a more determined effort to consciously deal with some of the ethical issues of the 1970s. Probably the churches could increase their credibility by helping the nation think through some of these new issues so much in the public consciousness, especially of youth. There are perhaps scores of these new questions. Following are six that illustrate my point.

1. The concept of modernization. Environmentalists do not accept modernization as a viable concept. They think that the affluent society is at an end, and with it dies secularization and centralization, and possibly even technology. They argue for a cooperative approach to nature, smaller independent communities, and concentration on intermediate techniques. They say that rapid growth and abundance is no longer possible. What is needed, they say, are a better quality of life, a more intimate community, a steady state of affairs, and the self-actualization of man. Christian ethics has the responsibility to examine these ideas. While

their ideals may not be practicable, Christians who themselves are seeking the highest good for mankind should accept those that increase man's chances for survival. Sometimes we lose sight of the war of the environmentalists by emotional responses to their battles. As I understand it, what they want is not merely the preservation of the dolphin and the snail darter but the preservation of life. They somehow see human life related to all other life. There is something awesomely theological in this view. Paul said, according to Moffatt, "To this day, we know, the entire creation sighs and throbs with pain; and not only so, but even we ourselves who have the Spirit as a foretaste of the future" (Romans 8:23, Moffatt). The nest does not form the bird but shelters it in its formation; and whatever protects the nest, protects the formation. Nature sighs and throbs as the nest of man, all the more when man abuses it. Yet the ideals of the environmentalists must be measured by God's injunction to the first man to "subdue the earth" (Genesis 1:28). Somewhere modernization and environmentalism must reach an ethical and theological compromise. Leaders in Baptist thought have great responsibility at this point.

2. The ethics of frugality. There is not much question now that we are faced with the need for frugality. The only question is, not whether or not we shall choose frugality as a way of life, but whether or not we come to it orderly and without revolution. The days of plentiful wood and water, oil and gas, iron and coal are gone. They went with cheap copper, tin, zinc, and aluminum. The new ethics of frugality require us to make full and fruitful use of all remaining life resources. This applies not only to our nation, but to us personally, to our churches and to our denomination. Some will still urge us to a higher personal consumption and an even higher energy society, but is this possible? How can we go on using materials that no longer exist? Is technology an omniscient god? Is it omnipotent? Omnipresent? Or is the answer somewhere nearer man himself, man as finite but self-reliant, self-sustaining, and self-providing with God's help?

Certainly man cannot ignore the abundance of the earth, yet the ethics of frugality will prevail. Energy will not be eliminated, cars will not disappear, and technology will not pass into limbo. Yet we must somehow take things out of the saddle, and not let them continue to ride mankind, as Emerson suggested. We must recreate close communities out of our scattered, broken neighborhoods, receive our children back into our homes, integrate fully the ages, and strive for more interpersonal awareness. Tomorrow's communities must be humanly oriented, not materially oriented. "More modest accomplishments on a more human scale," someone has said. Buckminster Fuller, one of the speakers of this seminar, three years ago said, "Long before the end of the twentieth century, we will find all of humanity doing so much more with so much less that it will be enjoying a higher, legitimately richer, and ethically decent standard of living than has ever been experienced by any humans before us. With economic, physical, and environmental success for all will come completely new economic accounting. We now have the metals comprehensively recirculating, and

the know-how to accomplish all these tasks within the limits of already mined metals."⁴

The ethics of frugality will restore some of man's personal ingenuity, resourcefulness and improvisation, those qualities of his pioneer past lost in the age of abundance and convenience. This can be achieved with plenty of room for technological advances. The ethics of frugality should not preempt technology but conserve it, use it, and amplify it, even in the 1980s. Much thinking is needed on this question in order to bring it into theological perspective.

3. More confidence in man. In the beginning God said to Adam, "I will drive the animals by and you name them as you will." Later he said to Adam and Eve to replenish the earth and to subdue it. It is a confidence that God has never forsaken. Not so man, for he has often lost it, both in God and in others. We see this most often in man's thoughtless cynicism, constant negativism, proud egotism, impetuous judgmentalism, and slick caustic analyses of other people and their motives. Man in judging other men still looks on the outward appearance, while God looks into the heart. God looking into the heart has always believed in men more than men have believed in themselves, or in each other. He trusts them, so he made them free. Man does not trust other men, so he surrounds them with endless legalities. Distrust breaks the bank of human kindness. It creates communities of selfishness and generates wars. It is a vicious serpent that causes one person to devour another. Each has the tail of the other in its mouth, and both are eventually destroyed by the mingling of their poisons.

Biblical confidence in man leads to a concern for the plight of all persons everywhere. The human situation is frighteningly tragic for most people. Jesus saw that clearly and wept over the multitudes. He dealt with the terrible lostness of man, a lostness from which man did not have in himself the power to escape. He was deeply concerned for the socially disenfranchised, the morally illiterate, the spiritually destitute, the physically deprived, the racially segregated, the physically broken, and the evilly enslaved. He saw man's desperate sickness and vicious hunger. He saw him cowed and broken. He saw him as the victim of his own evil passions, evil imaginations, and evil heart. He saw man lost in the vast sea of suffering which he called "sin," and cried out for his repentance, his metanoia, his turning. It was for man that he came to earth, and for his sins that he died. He put it plainly, "For the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10) and so all the true sons of man. In more profound ways than we have yet seen the word "lost" has a terrible human meaning and the cross of Christ stands at the heart of ethical motivation. In the new times spirituality will be measured by how much the Spirit of Christ moves his people to good works, not by how much people boast of their own holiness; and not merely how well they speak or organize, but how well they feed the hungry, and help the distressed, and how well they deal with their own violent passions.

The new decade should bring new awareness of the sufferings of all persons everywhere.

4. The tyranny of franchise. George Orwell did not quite see it that way, but the

golden arches of McDonald's at every crossroads, a K-Mart sign in every neighborhood, and the wearisome conventionalizing of the cities, so that all are the same, may say that 1984 is already here. Not only do all McDonald hamburgers seem to taste alike, they seem to taste like all the others. Even the ones claiming to be different have appeared only to add water to make them juicier. It may be true that franchising has given some business men more opportunities, but it may also be true that it has destroyed many others. But the worst thing may be what it has done to life quality, and what it may be doing to private enterprise and human initiative. Century 21 may be a good thing for some people but for others it may make real estate sales a machine and clutter the streets with monstrous signs. Some say that it lines the skylines with monotony and disavows the uniqueness of communities and the individualities of people.

Why may franchise be tyranny? Here are some possible answers that need examination: (1) It robs man of his choice to initiate and propagate his own business in his own name. (2) It flattens life into a formless formula. (3) It forces us to buy and sell as robots. (4) It makes the matrix of life incredibly dull. (5) It is not free enterprise for a maximum number of people. Ethics in the 1980s needs to seriously examine the idea of franchise.

5. The tyranny of indiscriminating news reporting. The people who uncovered Watergate did the country a great service. Without their tough, thorough reporting, the present trend toward cleaner politics would not have been possible. God forbid that we ever gag the responsible press. However, in the minds of many the trouble is that since the Watergate exposure there has been a tacit assumption that all public situations are Watergates and every reporter is capable of uncovering them. The post-Watergate journalistic mentality sometimes appears not to be wholesome, balanced, or responsible.

In Nashville I was leaving a store next door to a small downtown bank. Police cars and people were gathered around the high front steps. I was told that a man had attempted to rob the bank and the police had him cornered inside. The crowd waited. Why? The police were waiting for all the media to appear. In a few minutes they came. Altogether there were three TV cameras and five reporters and five photographers with an assortment of assistants with lights, recorders, dollies, et cetera. When everything was ready the police appeared with their victim. "Swoosh!" like an avalanche, all those reporters surged forward to photograph the robber. He was a small, bleary eyed creature, obviously not very bright, with the appearance of hunger, illness, despair, and retardation. It seemed to be a setup, pure and simple, designed to please the media. It was total disrespect for human dignity, a condemnation before arraignment and trial, a willful prejudicing of the public, a tyranny not of kings but of the awful desire to let it all be exposed at the cost of what little self-respect a lonely human being may have. I had the wicked and possibly erroneous thought that this is the same crowd that in Jesus' time accused the woman of adultery.

That day I was reminded of Oscar Wilde and his trial for sodomy in London. He was found

guilty. As he left the courtroom the spectators turned their backs. Only one man greeted him, a meek, retiring little fellow who simply tipped his hat to Wilde. The author said that in that one human gesture he began to find again his self-respect. I guess maybe James Reston would have called it one of the seeds of redemption in a hopeless situation. It seems to me that the thing most missing in today's journalism and surely the thing most needed to be restored in the 1980s is the willingness to be redemptive in all situations, redemptive not divisive, redemptive not destructive, redemptive not damning. I raise the question, has the tyranny of media replaced the tyranny of kings? I raise another question, what would John Milton say today? Will the 1980s bring us a new John Milton?

6. The unmasking of Americans. The realities of our inner lives must be exposed. We must crawl out from behind what Grady Nutt calls our "great extroverted front." Some will say, "How incredibly horrible." And they are right, for how can good people expose their sin and their sins? One confronted man asked, "What if I am a pastor and my sin is unbelief?" The lack of openness about ourselves may be one of our worst sins and responsible for our unbelief. Our hiddenness obscures both our humanity and our divinity. Not to face our hiddenness about ourselves may mean we do not truly understand repentance. As long as we hide any sin, true faith is impossible. Hiding our unbelief keeps us from finding our faith.

In one way openness and confession mean the same thing. God wants real people, not wooden people. He wants us, not our extroverted fronts. He wants all people to come out of their dead introverted swamps into his marvelous revealing light. God wants openness because he wants freedom. The more we move into the marvelous liberty of the sons of God, the more we escape our hidden introverted selves. The farther we leave behind the morass of contradictions, despairs, and doubts of our inner selves, the more pure in heart we become and the nearer to God we come, for Jesus said, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God" (Matthew 5:8). This is the great personal transaction possible in Christ; and this is the base on which meaningful ethical action can be built.

I suppose what I am saying is that in the 1980s the greatest ethical issue of all is what happens to hidden humanity, to interior man. How can we make men free and responsible and thus authentic building blocks for ethical action? The answer, of course, is in Jesus Christ, still the awesome mystery hidden to most of mankind.

Conclusion

I truly wish the 1980s, no matter how black the years, how despairing the times, how disoriented our lives, how uncertain our future, how broken our spirit, how fruitless our works, that in all of these negative situations--if they come--we discover the true seed of redemption, and that seed is Jesus Christ always present in the worst of times and darkest of nights.

Footnotes

¹Lyle E. Schaller, "The Impact of the Eighties," Search, Winter 1980, pp. 52-59.

²Ibid., p. 58.

³Ibid., p. 56f.

⁴R. Buckminster Fuller, "Fifty Years Ahead of my Time," Saturday Evening Post, March, 1977, pp. 44ff.

Facing the Crisis in Education

R. Kirby Godsey

Education, along with church has served as a force for change in our world. In our time, it is not so. We have become so conditioned by our cultural setting that we find it more and more difficult to transcend our own place and time.

Because it is the case, our society has looked less often to the schoolhouse for leadership. It is not merely that the philosopher is no longer king; more importantly, no one expects him to be. The path of the teacher should not be to solve all of our problems but rather to remain aloof, aloof if you will, to those problems--to never let us begin to believe that our fate will be set by the ambiguities and contradictions around us. If educators become victims of those ambiguities, we will no longer approach the Academy as a place to draw aside, to find perspective vision.

All of education in America faces the '80s with growing scrutiny, criticism, and censure. And it is so because we have entered the decade in the business of "hawking" diplomas and degrees, and the result has been teachers who do not want to teach and students who do not want to learn. Along with the priests and politicians, the professors have lost their charisma. Academia is running scared of a decade because the "census takers" and "opinion makers" have made clear that 300-500 of our institutions will close. But they have not added that most of them deserve to. And they deserve to, not chiefly because of too little money or too few students, but because of too little distance from the social order from which they are seeking to eke out survival.

This loss of transcendence is the cornerstone of the crisis in education. The issue is not the loss of students and their revenues but the inability to speak with simplicity and vision, to help them become people. Instead, we became an instrument of the marketplace. And what do we find there?

Chaos lies strewn about us--economic turmoil and human uncertainty about one another. Where can we turn--unless to the church for redemption, to the school for reflective probing of the human situation? But, when we turn to our teachers, what do we hear? We hear explanations of the GNP and learn about the CPI. And beyond that we find the critic having sold his independence to become a part of the marketplace, to look and to behave as a victim of the social order. Education has taken on the trappings of social propriety and managerial efficiency. Instead of the critic, we have found new gods and joined the march toward economic and social oblivion.

We seldom talk about what is good anymore. The language we use is more the language of strategy, the language of politics, the balance of power, and the effective economics. Yet, that is not where education was born. Education was born in the travail of struggling with the meaning of humankind. Plato's Academy was hardly concerned with matters of degrees or professional preparation. We have

advanced far beyond Plato; yet, we have not caught up with his vision. We have not caught up because Plato was driven by the yearning of the soul and the longing to know the essence and the insides of the world about him. It was not enough to study the external world, to collect the data, to count the acorns. Rather, he wanted to know what made a tree a tree and what did all trees have in common--not so much because a tree is important, but to know what makes a man a man or a woman a woman. And he tagged that essence the soul. What is really important and enduring about a person moved him. He longed to understand what a person is, to know his soul, his psyche, his ideas, and for good reason. It is apparent that some of what we appear to be does not endure. And whether we live until age forty or until age eighty becomes rather insignificant in the longer look and on the larger scale. How we spend our days becomes more important than their number.

Plato saw that education had to do with the care of the soul--that is, the essence of a person's life and not with the maintenance of the household. I wonder why we find that truth so difficult. What Plato taught may not be very important. But let us be clear that education was born in the Hebrew and the Greek tradition, in the belief that knowledge, wisdom, and understanding are intimately linked with the health of society.

Education today seems confused. The notions of understanding and wisdom are faint recollections, even anachronisms. What we have today is competence and a whirlpool of methodologies. It is true that the concern for competence at least attempts to match expectations and outcomes and to look as a whole at what is going in and what is coming out in the schoolhouse. Competence will no doubt improve the social order and will bring new steps of progress. What it will not do is develop the public good.

The public good is a quaint notion today; however, education today operates almost exclusively in the context of social progress, but I am learning that all of the social progress will not bring well-being to our life with each other. It has not even brought economic and social stability.

Our institutions have helped us advance our society, make our people more competent, helped us achieve better economic standards, all of which have been ends worthy of our pursuit.

Indeed, hardly anyone will argue that social progress should not be pursued. We need a more effective, better prepared, more knowledgeable people. We cannot dismiss these goals. But what we have lost is our transcendence. I enjoy having more than adequate food, clothing, living in comfortable surroundings, driving to work, being snug in winter and cool in summer. But let me never confuse that favorable quality of life with the goodness of life. I believe that our institutions of education are largely directed toward the requirements for social improvement and the knowledge required to be an able participant and contributor to that progress. And if it is so, we have confused the agenda for education.

Higher education has mostly become a function of the state. My view is that the state probably should not be involved in education beyond the level of high school or junior college. Public education should be about

preparing people to learn and to work. Though I will not take your time to discuss the ills of public education, in my view, there are many. I do not believe that schools can become surrogate parents. Back to basics is hardly enough. I hear back to basics speaking of teaching a high school graduate who reads at a fourth-grade level to read at the eighth grade. We are trying to do too much and to draw too large the circle of our responsibility in the early school years. In the schools we are teaching drivers' education, sex education, parenting, how to interview for a job, courses on alcohol and drug abuse, birth control, and marriage and the family. I think it is a mistake. We presume that everything a youngster needs to know should be taught in the elementary and secondary schools. I say horsefeathers to that. I say that the schools ought to forget teaching drivers' ed and sex education and how to be a parent. Let the Department of Motor Vehicles, or the church, or would you even believe the parents teach them how to drive or be a parent or how to make love more effectively.

I support vocational training--something we used to call manual training. But we need some vocational education we do not have. Vocation has to do with calling. Too many people no longer have a sense of purpose about their work--boredom more than purpose marks what they do every day. I refer not only to one on the assembly line; I refer to the teacher, the preacher, the social worker. These are people workers--bored! Decisions about work need to be made with greater self-understanding and with more reflection. People are going to school to get a job; it is a mistake. Somehow we live under the misguided notion that one does not have any work unless someone gives him a job. Work is not a task. It is a vocation, and the meaning of work has suffered in the midst of our social progress. Do not confuse job preparation with preparation for work. Vocational training is job preparation, and it is important to our society. But it may not prepare us for work. We need to augment vocational training with vocational education.

You and I have heard with such frequency that the real task of education is not to educate for work but to educate for leisure. I wonder about that. Fancy telling young and eager souls, "Now, what I really want you to learn is how to kill time when you have nothing to do." As Thomas Aquinas said, "There can be no joy in life without joy in work." Also, another nineteenth century thinker was reported to have said, "Watch out--if you get too many useful machines, you will get too many useless people." That also may be worth pondering.

The loss of transcendence in education may be seen in the relationship of education and work. Work has been confused as an essentially economic act. If we say, "He works," or, "She works," we generally mean that he or she is doing something in return for a wage or a salary. Conversely, when we say someone is out of work, we mean generally that they are not occupied in a way that brings them income. The man may sweat all day rebuilding the garage, but if he is not being paid, in the prevailing view, he is not working.

An even better illustration, which I presume the feminists are unraveling, is the redundant term, "working mother." To most people, a working mother is not a woman who

is involved in managing a house, cooking, marketing, chauffeuring, and coping with the random and undisciplined wants of children and a husband. Such a woman is not working. She becomes a working woman only when she also goes off somewhere to engage in an activity for which she earns a salary. Working, we believe, is an exclusively economic act. The main purpose of work is economic gain. Consequently, the import of education is economic. And thus we come full circle. Education becomes an instrument for reinforcing that society and human life are essentially economic. Instead of giving perspective, balance, insight, we become a part of the social fabric, training people to fit into the social whole.

Until just yesterday, as history tells time, the identity of the school and the university had to do with learning, understanding, growth of the human spirit. Since World War II, we have erupted into a literal revolution in education in the United States --mass education. The merchant ethic has dominated education. And we hear people lament that our people are being overeducated. It is not so. Instead, we may be missing the point of education.

We face the '80s wondering about enrollments, busing, financing, and back to basics when our institutions have come to reflect more the burdens of a troubled world than the anvil on which better solutions are struck. You survey the halls of the academic shopping center and there you will find the same hollowness and echo to be found outside. Our problem in the '80s will be called out to be: demographics, attrition, interest rates, energy costs, and dipping SATs.

I judge those matters to be tangential, to be peripheral, to be tertiary. Those issues may determine whether an institution survives, but not whether it lives or dies. We must be willing to permit our institutions to come to an end, no longer to exist. For their immortality will reside not in their continued existence--can we remember--not in their continued existence, but in the good work, the good learning, the wisdom they have bestowed upon those who journeyed there. Education was founded in the search to understand what life, including work, is about, and we must not abandon that sense if education is to have any bearing on what our world becomes.

Let me speak with candor about what the recovery of transcendence in education will require:

1. Education must find again its focus upon reason. We have diluted the power of reason and replaced it with the power of strategy and politics. We need to elevate reason again, to enable people to subject their disputes and disagreements to reason and debate. I do not believe that all human problems will be solved by rational discussion, but I do believe that we have come to rely more on having, on position and power, than upon thinking. Having cannot be the measure of a person; I want to know what someone thinks and believes, to build a public order based more on reason than one's place in society. One of the matters that impresses me about my own work is the highly political character of it. The use and abuse of people remains devastating in every organizational and social context. One element of cure will be the recovery of the power of

reason in human experience. Education is not about emotional coping; it is about rational coping. The academy has been built around the power of reason, and the loss of reason will surely spell disaster for the public order.

Our best example is very near. The democratic way is based upon the assumption that free people will make rational choices. The success of the American political and social system is not at all clear. Our structures of governance may not survive our own self-interest. But, if we do, we may be certain indeed that our nation will survive, not because of our economic or military power. Our economics can be thrown into chaos by a substance so simple as oil, and our military strength can only insure that we will not die alone. We will take a large segment of the world along with us.

2. Education for transcendence must recover the sense that education is a moral undertaking. Have we really forgotten that learning shapes human character? Any attempt to back away from the responsibility inevitably distorts the journey of learning. That's why Christians entered this journey. Yet, as Christian learning places, we have largely abandoned our own reason for being and chased off the herd. Our case statement has been that we must not be concerned only with what people know, but what they believe and what they regard to be important. Yet, if we believe our own voices, why do we fear the questions of morality? Why are we unable to say one act is wrong and another is right?

I believe that the concern for human character and the capacity for human decision must be restored to education. We cannot be content to educate only for the purpose of performance. More important than what college graduates will be able to do will be their ability to subordinate emotional reaction to rational discussion; it will be their ability to bring compassion, integrity, and virtue to their work and their human relationships. It is for that reason, mostly, that I have cast my own lot with Christian education--not because Christians have all the answers. They do not. But because it is imperative, as we face decades of scarcity and fear and conflict, that people be able to act with wisdom and bring grace and rightness to bear upon human conflict and uncertainty.

Whether education deserves to flourish depends upon the issues of morality, character, leadership, and wisdom. The intellectual and moral survival of our civilization is not at all secure. We are very dependent upon our technology and we will move forward there. We will be able to link up thinking machines with the human mind. We will create life outside the womb. We will cure disease, but the same knowledge and power can also victimize us and enable us to destroy one another more efficiently, with less debris.

The difference between human progress and disaster will not be whether we know enough but whether we are good enough. I want to be a part between now and the year 2000 of renewing in education the kind of dialogue that sought wisdom in the Koheleth of the Old Testament, in Plato's Republic, in Aristotle's Ethics, in studying and understanding the history of saints and sinners, of heroes and cowards. For our greatest discoveries will not be the outer reaches of the galaxies; our greatest discoveries will be the inner recesses of the human spirit. Education must

help us achieve wisdom and virtue among us.

Yes, I am suggesting that we will not be served alone by the advancement of technology or by the dissemination of better skills, or even by the cure of inflation. We must accomplish those ends. We cannot diminish them. Let us not, however, begin to believe in them or to trust our future to them. The chaos will find new clothing; the demons will persist.

In the midst of our advancement and the external forces that make life more comfortable, let us also preserve the retreat into the inner life, for it will do us little good to live comfortably unless we can also live well. Unless we preserve the retreat, our education will be overcome by boredom. Can we see again that the journey of learning must take us into the issues of greatness and goodness where our own passions become disciplined by the awareness that justice is better than injustice, that love is better than hate, that integrity is better than dishonesty, that compassion is better than insensitivity, that hope is better than despair, that faith is better than infidelity, that peace is better than war, that knowledge is better than ignorance, that being is better than having?

Education has a high calling. The skills must be taught and taught more effectively. But we must also give the young a glimpse of the goodness and the greatness of life--a goodness and greatness that will flourish only where listening and thinking, where wonder and grace are a part of the human way. In brief, we need not only more knowledge, but more wisdom.

It is important that we build private institutions that bear a special purpose and character, that speak of solitude, that speak of relating, of loving, that drive us to the inner resources. We cannot be content to mimic or to fall into step with our public counterparts.

The wisdom of our social system has been diversity and open inquiry. Let us not be afraid of the young who will question our society or criticize the generations before them. It is time to have our culture, our politics, our economics challenged by people who will say, "It is not good enough." And you and I must preserve those centers of learning where it is possible to ask the hard questions, where the young can ask, "Is it good enough?" And unless our institutions can encourage and permit the question to be posed, we have abandoned the calling of higher education.

The days before us require the educated who can serve as critic for our time--who can become a force for a new constellation of expectations. We have become a part of the burden, a part of the baggage to be carried. We cannot be content to insulate one another from the foundations being shaken by the chaos. Education cannot be in the business of passing out shock absorbers. Our time will not be known by the chaos, but by the quality of mind and spirit that addresses the chaos.

Education should not seek to deny the society, neither to destroy or diminish. But we must treasure our independence. Are we merely to educate about our world or are we responsible to be educators for our time? That is the issue for the '80s.

Why is the church into the work of education? Our record is not clear; our motives

have been confused. We have built schools not only to nourish our work but to undergird our prejudices. We cannot justify our schools under a protectionist model. We have offered inferior, understaffed, overrated education and called it Christian. It will take more than praying in class and instruction in the Bible to warrant our excursion into education. Indeed, we must not look to the school primarily for that instruction. We cannot hope to make up for the loss of a vital church and the abandonment of the family community by compressing the functions of each into the classroom. The distinctive achievements of Christian education will not be curricular. We will not be able to manipulate courses and plan educational strategies that will offer wisdom to our world. The crisis of education has arisen because we have tinkered with the vestiges of learning, have appended teaching with a religious connotation, but we have not stood in the midst of the scurrying confusion as a refuge, to ponder the grace, to seek a higher wisdom. We have not offered a place for solitude, for silence, for critical inquiry. Rather, we have simply sought "to keep up" by teaching what we do not understand, describing what we do not see, of speaking when we have not heard.

It is transcendence that must teach us that, in the arena where I live, education can either become a spiritual undertaking or we have no mission to pursue. Being a spiritual undertaking means that we enter our work with the confidence that what we do in the living out of our days will be shaped not only by what we know but by where we stand. The expectation of the Christian institution must lie in the matter of vocation. To be sure, we cannot do a less credible job of educating. We cannot allow our institutions to become bastions of educational mediocrity. And many are there and below. We cannot seriously believe that the "something extra," vaguely-defined and ill-conceived, somehow supersedes the need for discipline and educational quality. It is only in the context of educational excellence that we can make our case stand for "something extra." And if our case stands, it will be because it is built upon the lessons of the spirit. Hear the lessons of the spirit: We are learning to fly through the air faster than the breaking of day; and that's good, but it is not enough. We are learning to link up thinking machines and human minds and that's good, but it is not enough. We are learning to communicate around the world with incredible speed and precision; and that's good, but it is not enough--unless, we have something to say. I say today that the lesson of the spirit is this: Ours is not an issue of intelligence, it is an issue of wisdom. The question is not whether we know enough, but whether we are good enough to keep our world together. And there lies the crisis in education.

An Economic Ethic for an Uncertain Decade

J. Philip Wogaman

The relationship between economics and ethics is always a challenging subject. Usually it is also controversial. It is controversial because people tend to become irritable when their self-interest is called into question, and it is seldom possible to discuss economic ethics without appearing to undermine somebody's self-interest. The Baptist theologian Walter Rauschenbusch doubtless had this in mind when he wrote these memorable words in the preface to his first great book:

In a few years all our restless and angry hearts will be quiet in death, but those who come after us will live in the world which our sins have blighted or which our love of right has redeemed. Let us do our thinking on these great questions, not with our eyes fixed on our bank account, but with a wise outlook on the fields of the future and with the consciousness that the spirit of the Eternal is seeking to distil from our lives some essence of righteousness before they pass away.

We do well to heed those words in the 1980s, even though they were originally written for the less complicated world of 1907. For now, as in 1907, it is imperative that we think ethically about economic life.

The Connection between Ethics and Economics

I find that most people tend to divorce economics and ethics. Perhaps they trust in Adam Smith's "invisible hand" to make it all work out in the end if we just pursue our own well-being. It is certainly true that, since the time of Adam Smith, we have tended to treat economics as a self-contained sphere--as though it were an exact science. But of course it is very far from being an independent sphere or an exact science; it is very much dependent upon the values people bring to it. If economics were such an exact science, we might be spared the spectacle of a John Kenneth Galbraith or a Robert Heilbroner perceiving things so very differently than a Milton Friedman or even a Paul Samuelson. After all, they are all well-trained economists, and they all have access to the same factual data.

Part of the problem is suggested in the old Chinese proverb that two-thirds of what we see is behind our eyes. Much depends upon the basic attitudes and assumptions and values that we bring to bear in interpreting what we see.

Economic ethics is concerned about the achievement of moral values through economic life. Economics refers to the means, but the moral values are the ends. One of the reasons for the disagreements among economists is that so often they are concerned about different ends. There is, in fact, a close correlation between economic systems and the values they are best designed to serve. For instance, feudalism provided economic support for values of loyalty and paternalism and hierarchy. Laissez faire

capitalism successfully emphasized freedom and creativity. Keynesianism, at least until recently, provided strong support for productivity, growth, and stability in the economy. Socialism has emphasized equality and social unity. And the new economic ideology that I have termed "conservationism" is most concerned about environmental wholesomeness and the sustainability of economic life on this planet for the long-run future. So there is a sense in which the great debates among the economic systems and ideologies are really disputes over which values should be given highest priority. The problem is that the basic value questions are seldom brought out frankly and openly. In the long run the most important contribution of church people may be to help everybody focus on the value questions that are at stake in the economic debates of this uncertain decade. And the first responsibility of Christians is to clarify the basic values which we use in judging economic policies and practices.

Basic Christian Moral Attitudes

I wish to suggest five guiding moral attitudes for Christians as we face the issues of the eighties. While there is not time to develop them in detail, I believe each of these attitudes is solidly rooted in the Christian gospel.

The first is that Christians must take material well-being itself very seriously. We remember that God created this physical world for positive reasons. We do not think of the material realm as being at war with the life of the spirit; we think of it as being supportive of the spiritual. That is an important difference between Christianity and some Eastern religions and, if I may say so, between authentic Christianity and a falsely spiritualistic Christianity. Thus, improvements in the economic well-being of people can be regarded as faithful stewardship of God's material gifts so long as this is in harmony with other Christian values.

Second, Christians are convinced of the value of individual life, individual freedom, and individual creativity, because each individual life is precious in the sight of God. Human beings are not mere means to economic ends. Each person must be encouraged and helped to make his or her own unique contribution, and each must be respected as a person of dignity and worth.

Third, we are committed to the basic unity of the whole family of humankind. The whole of humanity is God's intended covenant community; all of us are sisters and brothers in God. We therefore understand economic life at its best as undergirding, not hampering, this basic human unity. Economic questions are ultimately a matter of how brothers and sisters deal with one another. Moreover, Christians understand how the individual and social dimensions of human nature are bound up with each other. There are no authentic individuals apart from society, and there can be no society apart from respect for the uniqueness of individuals.

Fourth, we regard individuals as equal. There are, to be sure, individual differences and inequalities of temperament and ability and environment. But we are all equal in the most basic sense that we are equal in value before God. Therefore, economic life cannot be structured so as to treat some people as having greater value than others. So far as possible, economic life needs to

treat people equally.

Fifth, we also take the limitations of human life seriously, including the tragedy of sin and the fact that none of us can do everything or know everything. Therefore economic life needs to offset, to compensate for these inevitable limitations. We cannot presume that any individual or group has all the answers, and we had better make due allowances for the selfish aspects of human nature in ourselves and in others. This probably means that society will always have to make some provision for incentives. But it had also better lead us away from economic self-righteousness. There are many prosperous people in our society who assume that their fortune is reward for moral goodness and that poor people, after all, have only gotten what they too deserve--an attitude like the nineteenth century bishop's remark that "godliness is in league with riches." But often it would be more realistic to attribute good fortune to sinfulness! In any case, self-righteousness is the one sinful attitude that Jesus condemned with great regularity.

These basic attitudes and values do not settle all the economic questions. But they are the lenses through which economic experience needs to be refracted for Christians. They are the basis upon which we interpret what we see and hear and do about economics. When we face uncertainties, we measure the truth by these standards.

The Uncertain World of the 1980s

How will these basic Christian attitudes be put to the test in the 1980s? None of us can know just what this decade will bring. There has not been a time since the Great Depression when economic forces have seemed more volatile and unpredictable and when great thematic issues were more difficult to grasp. Our projections quickly fall short. For instance, The Washington Post, as recently as January 13, published the following "prognostications for 1980": "Consumer prices probably will rise by between 10 and 11 percent over the next 12 months, down from 13 percent for 1979" and "Interest rates are expected to edge downward over the year after most likely having peaked late in 1979." Consumer prices are in fact up, and interest rates are way up. Measures to combat the dangerous inflationary trends portend unemployment are recession, and some sober analysts speak of the possibility of a major depression or other economic crisis. I must confess that I just do not know what to predict along those lines.

But one point is becoming increasingly clear: We are not likely to be able to finance new priorities or improvements in social justice out of the increments of real economic growth. Improvements in economic justice will have to be paid for by cutting back on the luxuries we don't really need. That is not necessarily bad! But it does mean that we may have more conflicts ahead of us as social groups struggle over a limited-size economic pie and not a continually growing one. There are many good explanations of inflation in our time--most of them containing some of the truth. But one important avenue to understanding inflation is to see it as a product of intensified conflict over fixed or diminishing resources. Faced with such limitations and the pressing expectations of various segments of society, it is a good deal easier for governments to allow the supply of money and credit to bal-

loon ahead than it is to make the hard decisions of social and economic priorities.

The underlying economic picture becomes clearer when we look at the rate of real growth of average family income since 1950. In the 1950s that growth was 37 percent. In the 1960s it was 35 percent; but in the last decade, the 1970s, it was only 4 percent; that despite the larger number of two-income families. The truth seems to be that American families are, by and large, actually worse off than they were at the beginning of the 1970s, although inflation means they are handling many more dollars. In such a limited growth situation, nobody can be helped very much without squeezing somebody else. Conceivably we may be on the verge of another great economic spurt, fueled by some unforeseen new cheap source of energy or a series of unpredictable new inventions. But even if that should happen--and who can predict the unpredictable?--the claims of the rest of the world may in fact absorb most of the growth increment. It may be more likely that the whole world will face economic recession together.

Issues for the 1980s

The overall situation we face is unpredictable and a bit gloomy. We simply cannot know exactly what to expect in this decade. But it may at least be possible to point toward five important issues that are likely to be resolved, one way or another, during this period. The way in which these issues are resolved will partly depend upon what we do about them.

Issue number one is the large ideological and systematic question about the future shape of world economic life: Will it basically move more toward the capitalistic, free market model or will socialism increasingly seem to be the wave of the future? It probably will not be either of these in pure form, but the major tendency is likely to tilt decisively toward one or the other in the coming decade. The decision will be based in part upon sheer economic performance. In part it may be affected by military balances of power and other considerations. But in large part it will depend upon the attitudes and values of people.

Christian thinkers are already involved on both sides of this struggle. Liberation theologians, such as Gustavo Gutierrez and Rosemary Reuther, argue vigorously that socialism is the most authentic expression of Christian economic ethics in our time. Capitalism, in their opinion, is hopelessly committed to the most materialistic, greedy, and oppressive forces of the age. On the other side, Michael Novak, who is also pessimistic about the future of capitalism, argues that the case for capitalism as the most moral alternative is virtually open and shut. He views the possible triumph of socialism as a moral catastrophe which could well usher in a new dark age. He writes that "if democratic capitalism does perish, it will not be because its political system permitted a lesser range of liberties and civilities. It will be because its cultural leaders never perceived, never expressed, and too poorly defended its moral ideals."

I do not believe Christian ethics gives us a wholly clear answer about this conflict--not yet. But it does give us a basis for judging the actual performance of both capitalism and socialism. Capitalism will not be judged ultimately on the basis of corpo-

rate balance sheets, rates of growth and rates of profit. It will rise or fall on the basis of whether it really does yield a better human condition for the powerless as well as the powerful, for the developing countries as well as for North America and Western Europe and Japan. Socialism, on the other hand, will not be judged finally in terms of Marxist rhetoric and ideological purity, but on whether it too can yield better material results and a world of moral community, democratic government, and human freedom.

My plea to American Christians is that we be very open about this historic confrontation. We have no business treating capitalism as a "sacred cow" above criticism and challenge. Most Americans do not know the deep hurt and anger out of which socialism is born, and that may be especially true of business leaders. That is an insulation which we must help to break down. In fact, we do the business community itself no favor by helping it to ignore the questions concerning human wretchedness and need that much of the rest of the world wishes to press upon our society. As Christians, we can make an important contribution to the resolution of the capitalism vs. socialism debate if we keep open minds and if we remain committed above all to the Lord who transcends all economic systems.

The second issue for the 1980s would be with us whether or not we had to face the debate over capitalism and socialism. That is the question whether world trade relationships can be restructured so as to serve the cause of world justice better. The great gap between the rich and the poor is, of course, no secret. In moral terms, it may be the most critical fact of our age. Observe: In 1976 the richest fifth of the world's peoples received 69 percent of world income, while the poorest fifth received only 1.7 percent. And this has been getting worse, not better. The richest fifth went from 66.4 percent in 1964 to 69 percent in 1976, and the poorest fifth went down from 2.9 percent in 1964 to 1.7 percent in 1976. Half of the world's people in 1978 lived on less than \$410 per year, and half of the people living in Least Developed Countries live on \$75 or less per year. The developing countries face mounting trade deficits and debt. Increasingly the economic growth of such countries is eaten up with debt service charges--that is, the interest payments alone. Many of the commodities upon which these countries depend for international exchange bring a much lower return than they did a few years ago. For example, in 1960 6 tractors could be gotten in trade for 25 tons of rubber, but in 1975 it took 75 tons of rubber. In 1963 5 tons of sisal from a country like Tanzania would pay for a tractor, but by 1970 it took 10 tons.

In face of this deepening crisis, 110 of the developing countries met in 1975 to propose the creation of a New International Economic Order (NIEO), emphasizing changes in trade relationships and modification of credit terms. Reaction from prosperous countries has generally been negative, particularly since the prosperous countries have themselves been facing economic problems like inflation. The great danger of the 1980s is that, far from helping the developing countries, the rich industrial countries of North America and Europe will organize the world against the have-nots. A

collateral danger is that we will in fact help the rich elites of these countries to organize their own economies against their own poor people.

The role of the transnational corporations may be increasingly important. Some observers, like Richard Barnett, believe these giants are profoundly opposed to the real development needs of the Third World. Others regard them as the creative genius of a new world order of prosperity for all. The truth may be somewhere in between, but it is increasingly apparent that these giants must be challenged at two points: Whether their production and marketing practices in poor countries are consonant with the needs of the vast majority of people and whether their global power is sufficiently accountable. The 1980s may well tell us whether this vast new economic reality can be disciplined in the human interest.

The third issue is whether the dynamic thrust toward justice for workers can be maintained or whether it will be blunted in the decade ahead. I am thinking of the gains made through unionization and the improving status of ethnic minority groups and women. Certain segments of American business have consistently attempted to weaken collective bargaining. Only this last week I received an invitation to attend a seminar on "How to Avoid Unions: A Seminar designed to help the business community establish and maintain a non-union environment." Many businesses deliberately seek out locations for production that will have a supply of cheap, non-organizable labor--in this country or abroad. Christians, of all people, must be sensitive to the need for workers to have sufficient collective power to defend their just interests--not because workers are more moral than other people, but because workers in an industrial society have less power as individuals. Not only has unionization benefitted workers themselves, through improvements in wages and working conditions, but it has probably also enhanced productivity through development of a better trained, more stable work force. One economist, W. Arthur Lewis, has recently gone so far as to argue that the higher status and purchasing power of the work force of America and Western Europe is an important reason for the greater prosperity of those regions than of the Third World areas where labor is typically underpaid and exploited. Church people may have a special obligation to encourage and not discourage union organization in communities where this is a problem--as it may be particularly throughout the American South. Perhaps Southern Baptists could make a major dent in that problem during the 1980s if they set their minds to it.

Regarding minorities and women, we can rejoice that great strides toward equality of treatment have been made in recent years. Still, we cannot overlook that black people are twice as likely to be the victims of unemployment and women still suffer from discrimination in employment and income. Nor can we ignore the ominous suggestion that we've already gone as far as we should go. If we keep faith with the progress of the past and resolutely implement affirmative action during the coming decade, we may find by the end of this decade that justice for ethnic minorities and women is no longer much of an issue. But much will depend upon what we do.

The fourth issue is whether American society can lower its consumer expectations. We have just been through a period that some have called the "me decade," the period of "narcissism." A whole spate of books and articles has been directed toward self-help in getting rich or surviving the anticipated times of economic trouble or gaining more personal hedonistic enjoyment or learning how to be self-assertive. Has this country ever had a period of greater unrestrained personal selfishness? The effects of this have gone beyond economics to further undermine the family and other pivotal institutions of American culture. It all reminds me of the celebrated remark attributed to Samuel Gompers during the early period of the American Federation of Labor. A reporter asked Mr. Gompers what labor's real objectives were. His answer was simply, "more." At that time, that was a legitimate goal for labor. But today I wonder whether "more" has become the governing objective of most individuals and groups in our society, including especially those who already have vastly more than their share of the world's goods and services--like most of us.

During the troubled, uncertain decade that lies before us we will literally tear this society apart if we do not learn to subordinate selfishness to the public interest and the common good. Competitive greed can easily exacerbate economic crisis. Greed heightens inflationary pressures. It diminishes creative venture and heightens defensiveness--such as purely speculative uses of money, reliance upon protectionism rather than stimulation of trade, and hampering rational governmental measures. A recent study of the economic crunch in American higher education reported that faculties and administrations of colleges and universities were generally well aware of the economic difficulties and the need for retrenchments. But they generally had what the study referred to as the "but not me" spirit. "There is need for sacrifice and retrenchment, but not by me." Of course, that is the spirit that makes it difficult to enact tax reforms and to balance the Federal budget. Those who already have the upper hand economically are always in the best position to say "but not me" and make it stick.

But selfishness and materialism diminish life more than they enhance it. I will go so far as to say that they are really only a poor "consolation prize" for people who have lost a real sense of meaning and purpose.

And so my plea is for us to seek profounder cultural visions for our time. Let that vision reflect the deepest insights of our Christian faith into the meaning of human existence and into our worth as persons and our participation with one another in the life of the community.

I suspect we may be facing during the 1980s a new version of Gunnar Myrdal's famous "American dilemma." You recall that that was the conflict between the debased, selfish values of racism and the nobler ideals of Christianity and American democracy. Perhaps we confront that kind of choice now in the area of economics.

God has blessed our rich earth with incredible abundance. But much depends upon our ability to work together for the common good. It may be that we, under God, will yet be able to shape a new earth and that during this period of the 1980s Christian

men and women, in cooperation with all persons of good will throughout the world, will be able to lay enduring foundations for a great new age.

A New Day for Families

Jim Guy Tucker

I'm delighted to be here in New York and to have this opportunity to visit with and to applaud what the Southern Baptist Convention and the religious community in general are doing to support families. I would like to be clear about one thing from the outset so I'm not sailing under any false colors. I am not an expert on families by any stretch of the imagination, and I know that modest disclaimer would be wildly applauded by my wife, our three children, and probably even our dog.

I come here not as an expert on families but as a private citizen and an attorney who has served in public office for over eight years, and who has had the opportunity during the past year to be deeply involved in the listening process that has gone on across the country as part of the White House Conference on Families.

You are involved in one of the most important and challenging tasks facing any group of Americans--finding ways to strengthen families. Churches and synagogues are the best friends families have in this country. Families all over the nation find irreplaceable strength and support and values within their religious beliefs and practices and traditions. As we've gone across this country from Lindsborg, Kansas; and downtown Kansas City at the YWCA to Seattle, Washington; to a high school in Stamford, Connecticut; an Hispanic high school in Denver, Colorado; to Nashville, Tennessee; we've heard families say they expect more and they get more from their churches and from their synagogues than from any other institution in the nation.

These families don't want government or other institutions interfering with or replacing religious institutions. Families don't want government or media telling them what to believe or trying to establish any single set of values; but families do want government and other major institutions to catch up to the religious community in understanding the deep importance of family values and relationships, to stop ignoring the importance and value of those relationships, and to start asserting those family values.

Churches are providing leadership all over the nation in developing family life programs, preparing young couples for marriage, conducting marriage enrichment efforts, and a vast variety of other activities. They are deeply involved in counseling and supporting those families which are experiencing conflict and providing a spiritual anchor for family life.

For all of these reasons, the religious community was singled out by President Carter in selecting the leadership of the White House Conference on Families. Ten members of the National Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on Families bring national leadership responsibilities within religious organizations to our Conference, including your own Harry Hollis of the Southern Bap-

tist Convention. Baptist, Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, and Mormon--those members come from national leadership experiences; and a wide range of other religious memberships and activities are represented among the National Advisory Committee. I hope the Southern Baptist Convention, and you individually, will continue to exercise leadership in this area.

Churches could be a model in analyzing and evaluating programs and policies for their effects on families. I hope all of you will take a hard look at your own programs and that each local congregation will evaluate how its own efforts help or hurt or ignore families and how they can be more responsive to the strengths and problems and diversities of family life. I also hope you will work for greater sensitivity toward families by federal, state, and local governments, as well as greater sensitivity by business, by unions, by media, and by other major institutions.

Virtually every constituency in America is represented in Washington, D.C. There are organized representatives of business, of labor, of the rich, of the poor, of black, of white, of North, of South; but who speaks in Washington or elsewhere in this country consistently and without ideological blinders for family?

In eight years in public office as a district attorney, as a state attorney general, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, dealing with tax law and welfare law, energy law and criminal law, and a whole range of public policy concerns, not one time did I ever have a witness come before me individually, or before a committee or conference on which I served, and testify about the impact of a policy or a proposed policy on families. They talked about what it would do to business or unions or rich or poor or some region of the country. But I never had a single witness come in and talk about the impact on that institution within which the overwhelming majority of the American public lives--the families of this nation. It is something to which we lend a great deal of rhetoric, but upon which we focus very little systematic analysis or attention when we make our policy decisions.

The fact is, there is no better foundation for a new policy of sensitivity toward families and the diversity of families than the values of love, fidelity, charity, and justice which flow directly from our Judeo-Christian traditions and the ethical and religious commitments of the American people. If we would only practice what we preach, families would have a far better opportunity to cope with the difficult challenges of the 1980s.

This is critically important because families have been ignored and neglected in our country too long. That neglect shows itself in a great many ways: in a lack of respect and concern for family values; in a tax code which discriminates against marriage itself; a tax code that makes one family's child of greater value on the tax return than the child of the family living next door; in welfare laws in effect in many states which tell a family that they can receive benefits only if the family breaks up and the father leaves the household; in Medicaid and social service policies which tell you that if you put your elderly mother in an institution to be cared for by strangers, the government

will assist you, but if you would like to keep your mother at home during her illness--perhaps her final illness--to care for her, that you will receive no assistance at all for care by family; personnel policies in effect in government and private institutions which do not take into account family responsibilities or the needs of employees with regard to their family life; transfer policies, sick-leave policies, pregnancy policies, working hours policies; and a lack of positive affirmation of family values in the media and other institutions.

President Carter called the White House Conference on Families to try to close this gap in public policymaking and to replace this neglect of family and family values with a conscience, concern, and sensitivity for the ways in which government policies, and private policies, and actions help families, hurt families, or ignore families. We want to build this Conference on the strength of families in our nation. The Conference and its leadership and the thousands of people who have testified and taken part in this Conference clearly reject the idea that families are dead or dying. Instead, the testimony we've heard from coast to coast in every state is that families are alive; they are vital; they are diverse; but they are under enormous pressures: economic pressures, social pressures, political pressures, and the overall pressure of a rapidly changing nation and world where the speed of change is constantly increasing and frequently threatening to overwhelm individual families.

The White House Conference is a unique attempt to listen and to involve American families themselves in an analysis of the way policies in this nation affect them.

This Conference is a sharp departure from the normal way of doing things in Washington, D.C. When the President and the leadership of the Conference tried to make a decision on how to put this Conference together, we could have approached it from one of two ways. The standard way of putting together a White House conference on anything, or a task force on anything, is to call a group of experts together in Washington, D.C.; have them meet for a period of time with the enormous scholarly and professional expertise which they could bring to the task; and put together an excellent report complete with beautiful, lovely footnotes that are absolutely, perfectly documented. And that report, in turn, is turned over to Congress and the President and generally gathers dust on a shelf in Washington, D.C. from then on out. That is the standard approach to a Washington task force or conference or committee.

The other approach to take was the one that we adopted. I think our approach will ultimately be successful. But it does differ in several ways and it entails some risks. For example, the President told us to reach out, to listen to the American people themselves, and then to draw not only our delegates, but our issues from the American people themselves. It is significant that the first thing the National Advisory Committee on the White House Conference on Families did was to have a series of seven hearings across the nation in which we listened to the testimonies of 2,000 individual family members. I've been to a lot of government hearings and I know most of you have, too. At the typical government hearing there are thirty or forty-five people that show up--maybe, if it is a

good day. In these hearings, we had hundreds of people that showed up, frequently with no place to sit. We had our Advisory Committee panel listen to testimony from nine o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night the first day and from nine o'clock in the morning until we had to catch our planes late in the afternoon the next day.

We listened not only to people who came in to testify who had sent in prepared texts and sophisticated analyses and specific suggestions, but we listened to hundreds and hundreds of individual family members who simply read about it at the last minute and came to express their own deeply personal, emotional feelings about their family and families in this nation. The analysis, the suggestions, the stories we heard from these people were not left-wing stories; they were not right-wing stories; they were simply family stories. They were the stories of the families that come from all across this immensely rich and diverse nation. They were enormously moving stories. They were important stories; important not just for government and institutions, but stories that are particularly vital to the religious community of our nation.

That's the process that we started with in our hearings and we've carried the hearing idea on to the state level where we have requested all of the states in the nation to have their own state conference. The typical Washington way of doing the state conference is to send the state a bunch of money to put on their conference. All we sent the states was a letter to the governor of each state saying, "We hope that you'll consider having a state conference on families in your state." And we didn't send along one single dime of federal money. Our theory was that the governors and the people of this country cared so deeply about families and the values associated with families, that they would move forward on their own to have those state conferences. And with minor exceptions, that is precisely what has happened.

I've just come from Salt Lake City, Utah, where I had the opportunity yesterday to meet with the president of the Mormon Church and to attend the Utah state conference. Over 1,000 people were there. They had hearings in every single county in that state. For those of you who are not accustomed to a big state like Utah, many of those counties have very, very few people living in them. And the people who attended those county conferences said it was the best thing they had ever done. Nobody had ever come out there to listen to them before.

In Wisconsin over 1,300 people were present and they turned away another 500 or 600. In Denver where we met at South High School, 1,700 people came to the conference, totally filling the high school auditorium; they had to turn away another almost 2,000 people who wanted to come and take part in the state conference; there was simply no place to sit.

John Carr, my executive director who is here with me, voted in Maryland on the delegates from his neighborhood. Thirty-five hundred people stood in line just in his two-county area to vote on the delegates that would be elected from that part of Maryland. This is taking place from one side of the country to the other and it reflects the deep, intense emotional interest in families that exists throughout our nation. Now, I'll

admit that taking this kind of an approach is not the tidiest way in the world to elect delegates to a national conference or probably even to have the conference. There are much more orderly ways to do it. There are much more structured ways to do it that are far more predictable as to the outcome, that give you far fewer gray hairs and lines and worries. But, I don't think that that's a better way to do it.

I can almost promise you that the report that this Conference produces will not have the best set of footnotes that any White House conference has ever had. It is almost certainly going to have a number of very unusual ideas expressed in it, but I am solidly convinced of one thing. From eight years in politics, I know that if you genuinely want to see something happen in this country, you better start it with the people and move it up to Washington, D.C. instead of the other way around. That's what we've done with this Conference and it does have some rough edges on it. It does have some inconveniences. I'm sure it is troubling occasionally to one ideological viewpoint or the other. But what we're listening to is the American people and American families. If you have trust and confidence in the people of this country and the families of this country, then I'll guarantee you that you can have trust and confidence in the ultimate report that will come from this meeting. This is a better and a more reflective way of ascertaining the ideas and the commitments of the American people. It offers the prospect of real consensus and from that consensus, real action to strengthen and support families.

There are those who think we made the wrong choice and that people from different backgrounds and experiences and viewpoints cannot come together to discuss family issues. These people say the issues are too emotional; they're too controversial; they're too complex; but I think those people are wrong, and I think we'll prove them wrong in the process of this Conference. Family issues do touch sensitive areas and certainly we all feel very, very strongly about our families. The people across this country are demonstrating that we can reach across racial, religious, and ideological lines to find areas of common concern and agreement.

You know, it is the easiest thing in the world to disagree. It takes absolutely no effort whatsoever. Every one of you in this room, any one of you sitting out there, can turn to the other and you can work up a first-class disagreement with each other in no time flat. We know in our own family, if you want to have an argument with one of your kids, or if they want to have an argument with you, it sure is easy to do it. And certainly in our political process in this country finding an area where we can have a fight with one another is the simplest thing to do. The challenge to a democracy, just as the challenge to a family, is to find those areas of common agreement, the area of consensus, the area of compromise where agreement on value and direction is possible. That's the challenge to this Conference; and in hearings and state conferences across this country, that is predominantly what we are finding--people with deep feelings discussing difficult issues but nonetheless finding areas of agreement.

Before this Conference is ended, well over 100,000 American families will have taken part just in the state conference processes

and in the hearings, not counting the local, regional, and county activities that have taken place. All across the country, thousands of Americans are voicing their strong convictions that family has been ignored for too long and deserves the respect owed to it as a fundamental institution.

However, there are some unfounded fears about the White House Conference on Families, and I would like to touch on them briefly. The first concern that I have heard expressed on a constant and continuing basis is that discussing families, whether it's done through the White House Conference on Families, or whether it is done as a consistent policy of the eighties, can only be an exercise in nostalgia, a search for the good old days, or reflection on our own personal experience; and certainly there is a danger of that.

I am a white, southern, protestant, male of upper income level, with my own personal family background and experience. I know about my family and the values my family had as I was a child, as I grew up. Now that we have three children and are raising our own family, I know what my emotions and expectations and ethics and values are. Certainly there is a temptation for each of us, when we think about family, to focus only on our own particular family experience and background. All that a national focus on families requires is the sensitivity that, in addition to our own family background, there are millions of other families in this country with differing backgrounds and experiences and pressures. And that is vitally important to the success of this conference process.

A conference that excludes consideration of the problems and pressures of single parents raising children would be a conference that wrongfully neglected a large number of families in this country. And while the number of families is a relatively small percentage, only six or seven percent of the households in this nation, if you happen to be in one of these single-parent families, the size of the percentage is irrelevant. That family and the survival and the strength of that family is important. And this Conference owes that family consideration and respect and assistance.

The Conference will not ignore the family in Detroit where the mother testified about the difficulties of working while she tried to raise two small children. A national conference can't ignore that mother. I listened to her testimony, and I thought she was asking for some kind of community resource or church resource for day care. I asked her, "Do you need day care, is that what you're asking for?" She said, "I'm not asking for day care. I work the midnight to 8:00 a.m. shift." That was something that simply never dawned on me. What does a mother in this country do who is working midnight to 8:00 a.m. simply to have enough money to get along and raise her children? How does she take care of her children while she is at work? How does she provide for them and hold her family together?

Nor will this Conference ignore the family in Nashville that I met at a public school there that cares for the handicapped, with a beautiful little six-year-old daughter. Their daughter has cerebral palsy. When that couple wants to go to a movie together or have dinner together, spend a little bit of

time together as husband and wife, they can't simply call the teenager down the street to come in and babysit with their child. They require someone with substantial expertise and who has to be paid a lot more money. The pressures and problems on that family, thank God, are vastly different than those on mine. But that is a real family, with real concerns and sensitivities that may not be felt by other families in the nation. The Hispanic family in Denver, or for that matter, right up here in Connecticut where over 250,000 Hispanics live--the Hispanic family who speaks only Spanish, does not speak English--has a completely different set of problems than my family.

There are different religions, different numbers of children, families with problems of alcoholism or other chemical dependency problems, a whole range of different family concerns. Families where one spouse has previously been married and now children are living in the household that come from two separate marriages face different pressures than families that have not had that experience. Who are we to ignore any of those families? A White House Conference on Families will not ignore them and is not ignoring them around the country.

Men and women truly concerned about the welfare of humanity must focus on the realities of family life today, its strengths, as well as its problems and its pressures. We want to know about those pressures and strengths, and we're hearing about them all across the country.

But while stressing the diversity of families, at the same time I think it's important to recognize that a vast number of things have not changed. For example, about twenty-five years ago, a major study was done on the roles that various family members filled in just doing household chores. The study revealed that about eighty percent of the household chores were done by the wife, about ten percent by the husband, and about ten percent by the children. That study has recently been updated and after the enormous change of the late 1950s and the '60s and the '70s, they now report to us that in modern America eighty percent of the household chores are done by the wife, ten percent are done by the husband, and ten percent are done by the children.

That same report informed us that men today, however, are spending twice as much time with their children as they used to. That's all very encouraging and impressive until you read the footnote which informs you that they used to spend six minutes a day with their children, and now they spend twelve minutes a day with their children. Some things have not changed very much, and not just those small statistics.

Yankelovich did a poll about four years ago that had some fascinating findings on attitudes of parents and children on a wide range of what we would call traditional concerns and values. And the bottom line of it was that despite all of the pressures and concerns on families today, while there were some changes, overwhelmingly traditional values were still predominant. And those families who had some substantial personal doubt about the value of the traditional way of doing things, nonetheless, said they still wanted to teach their children that. They seemed to be saying that when in doubt on these issues, they'd rather stick with some-

thing that had been tried, and that they had some feel for, than strike out in a new direction.

So, in all of our focus on diversity, I think it is important to remind ourselves that the dominant form of existence in the country is still marriage. There is still a dominant desire to raise children, although a great many couples are choosing not to have children today. Dominant values that exist in families today are not vastly different than they were ten or twenty or perhaps even fifty years ago.

Others are concerned that this Conference will turn into a search for intrusive government solutions or suggestions for families. Nothing could be further from the truth. The whole suggestion of the President and of Harry Hollis and others who were leaders in suggesting some type of focus on families from the outset of this Conference, was not to have more intrusion, but to have more sensitivity, not just by government, but by private institutions as well. If you pay taxes; if you send your kids to public school; if you pay into or receive assistance from Social Security; if you are involved in any health or human needs program; if you have been touched by divorce or adoption or foster care, then government has touched your family. And there are thousands of other ways in which government touches families. The question is one of whether government will think about families as it touches them, or whether it will be insensitive.

Again, in Nashville, I could not help but be struck by the fact that we were only a few miles away from the Tellico Dam Project, a project made famous by a little critter called the snail darter. You'll recall that the snail darter is protected under the federal Endangered Species Act and when that creature was discovered in the vicinity of the Tellico Dam Project, the entire project with all of its federal dollars, its political support, and the economic momentum that had developed behind it, came to an absolute halt while government and people stopped and thought about whether they wanted to wipe out the habitat of this little thing called the snail darter.

Well, I don't want to take anything away from the snail darter. But, it does seem to me that in a nation where we offer so much rhetoric in support of family, that government at all levels and private institutions and the church at all levels would do well to at least pause and give something like the same kind of consideration to family that we, as a matter of national policy, give to something like a snail darter. And that is all the White House Conference on Families has asked.

We've heard many stories during the Conference. The stories have been family stories. I think the results of the Conference are going to be strongly supportive of families. I think it will be a report that will build a broad national consensus for family sensitivity at every level of national life. Ultimately whether or not that Conference is a success, I think, depends very largely upon the degree of constructive, positive contribution that the religious community in this nation can make to the Conference. You have a great challenge and I hope each of you will be personally involved in working with the delegates to the Conference and the recommendations to the Conference to strengthen

your family and my family and our nation's family as a whole.

Race Relations in the Eighties

Benjamin Hooks

There is a great novel written by Ernest Hemingway entitled The Old Man and the Sea, which to me symbolizes the plight, the challenge, and the great hope of the black community in America. Those of you who have read that book will recall that Santiago was a fisherman in the small village, that he had become the brunt of the jokes of the villagers because of his many unsuccessful months of going out to fish and catching no fish. On one occasion he had gone out for eighty-four consecutive days and had not brought back a single fish. Only one lad in the village encouraged him with the thought that "tomorrow will be a better day." So, on the morning of the climatic setting in the novel, the old man got up early; he sailed out farther than he'd ever sailed before; fixed his lines and dropped three of them into the sea--ten fathoms, twenty fathoms, forty fathoms deep. He determined that he would not go back without a fish that day; and suddenly there came a great tug on one of the lines. He knew then that he'd hooked the fish; and the fish was so large, apparently, that it began to pull the boat further and further out to sea. The old man was determined that this time the fish would not get away, and so he fed out the line.

Day changed into night and night into morning. He was tired, weary, famished, and thirsty. He had lacerated and bloodied his hands as he played out the line. He had even fastened it around his waist, and was bruised. He caught a smaller fish and ate it raw for sustenance. But he kept saying, "Old fish, no matter how much you fight, I'm going to catch you today."

Finally, the fish, apparently out of strength and out of breath, surfaced and leaped up. The old man discovered that he had landed a fish that was even bigger than the boat he was traveling in. Through the skillful use of his ability as a fisherman, he finally brought the fish in close to the boat and took his harpoon, that mighty spear of the sea, and with an unerring and quick thrust pierced the heart of the fish; killed it; brought it to the boat; lashed it securely; and, with a sigh of contentment, started toward the shore.

But the blood spilling from the fish attracted the sharks, those saber-toothed tigers of the deep. They started circling. Hemingway had the old man fighting the sharks--first with his harpoon, and then when the harpoon was gone, with a knife tied to the oar. He killed one shark, and another shark, and then when there was nothing left but short oars and the tiller, he started hitting the sharks on the head, but they continually circled. Each one pounced on the fish, grabbed a big piece of its flesh and moved off.

Finally exhausted, without any weapons left, Santiago kept on moving toward the shore, and the sharks kept nibbling away at the fish. And when he reached the shore, you will recall, there was not a single bit of flesh left on the fish, only the bones. He had caught the fish but he'd not been able

to make it safely into the harbor. But no longer would he be the brunt of the jokes of the villagers; for even though he did not have any of the flesh, the bones attested to his skill as a fisherman.

I sometimes equate the plight of black people in this nation with that concept, for we have sailed further and further out, but whenever we've seemed to have caught the fish, the sharks have a strange way of devouring the flesh and leaving us barely with the bones.

America is a nation where one can aspire to the highest positions in business, industry, and government. It is a nation where Thomas Jefferson took the ideal of French enlightenment and penned the phrase, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal." America is a nation conceived, in the words of Lincoln, of, for, and by the people. It is a nation that has used the scientific discovery stemming from the industrial revolution to catch what can be likened to Hemingway's big fish story--the promise that hard work pays off by yielding a high quality of life. It is a nation which has fostered capitalism and has allowed us to build large business conglomerates that can employ millions of people on a scale undreamed of in human history. It is a nation where we have caught the big fish of space exploration, medical ingenuity, and technological advancement. We, as black Americans, have been sustained by our belief in this country, our love for our country. Like the old man of the sea, this country is as much our life as the sea was his.

When we sailed out of bondage in 1865, we thought we'd caught the big fish of freedom. And I can hear them singing now from the cane bushes of the South, tobacco land, and cotton and corn plantations, "Oh freedom, Oh freedom over me, and before I'd be a slave I'd be buried in my grave and go home to my Lord and be free." But no sooner had we landed the big fish of freedom, than the sharks started circling. And we saw the enactment of grandfather clauses--Jim Crow laws; the origination of the Ku Klux Klan in Pulaski, Tennessee; the failure of the Congress to follow through on what we thought was a promise to deliver forty acres and a mule. So even though we had caught what we thought was the big fish of freedom, by 1898, when we had come through the Plessy vs. Ferguson decision that mandated constitutionally the concept of "separate but equal" which for sixty years was to be always separate but never equal, we discovered that although we had landed the fish, we could not take anything home but the bones.

In 1954, on the 17th day of May, black people rejoiced all over this nation because we had landed the big fish of equality in education. The Supreme Court on that historic Monday, in a unanimous opinion, declared that the doctrine of "separate but equal" was per se, by itself, illegal and unconstitutional. How our hearts rejoiced! But it was not long before the sharks of interposition, nullification, massive resistance, standing in the schoolhouse door, saying, "They shall never pass," reminded us that while we had landed the fish in the sea, we'd not been able to bring it to shore. And today almost twenty-six years later, we discover the sad fact that even in today's world in America more than fifty percent of all of our children still attend schools segregated almost

as they were in 1954.

And sadly, many of our churches have joined in this exodus away from freedom and have encouraged private academies, not so much for educational purposes but for the purpose of maintaining and exploiting segregation and to create and to foster an illusion that somehow integration will destroy the quality of education. We hear much ado about busing; but I would remind you today that there are some forty-two million school children in our nation, and more than half of them catch the bus every morning to go to school, and far less than ten percent of the total number are bused for the purposes of achieving racial integration.

Yet, when Ron Mottl introduced his bill to have a constitutional amendment to ban all busing for purposes of racial integration, he had the temerity to tell me on a national television program that he did it in order to save gas and to help President Carter in his conservation program. And I simply replied, "If you're serious, then why don't you deal with the bulk of the busing and not just with that part of it, that small part that deals with racial integration."

And I say this, my friends, because I do know that it is a job, and I conceive of myself to be somewhat of a prophet: that even when the words are unpopular and folk do not want to hear it, that we have to tell it anyway.

I read one of the Pauline epistles that suggested that there are only two times to preach anyway: one is in season and the other is out of season. There's a time folk want to hear it, and a time they do not want to hear it. We're bound and obligated to tell the truth as we see and know it all the time, for we serve an omnipotent and omniscient God who shall one day call us to account. He has not called us, I do not believe, to be comfortable, safe, and secure with our large, beautiful, marvelous, buildings, preacher vestments and robes on the choirs, with stained glass windows and red carpets. He has called us to preach the gospel of redemption, truth, and liberty even when it means that the days will sometimes be unpleasant and the nights will be hard, for we believe that the goal for which we strive is sufficient to take us through the darkest of days.

And so I say to you, that blacks in this country have been sailing through shark-infested waters. One of the enduring tragedies of this nation is that black folk have had to fight for the rights that other people take for granted. I for one would never be guilty of trying to pretend that things are not better now than they were twenty-five years ago, for they are infinitely better today.

I'm old enough to remember sitting on the back of the streetcar, attending rigidly segregated schools, drinking from water fountains designated for "colored," and using the "colored" rest room. I know what it is to drive all over this nation, not only the South but the North, and to have the money in my pocket and not be able to get a hotel room, not be able to get seated and fed a meal in a restaurant.

I recall once coming from the National Baptist Convention in Denver, and knowing the customs of the South. Out of the great prairie state of Kansas we passed a beautiful motel, and we decided we would go in to eat, and I thought it was something strange--

the personnel appeared flustered and concerned. There were three of us who were Baptist preachers. And finally they 'fessed up: "We do not serve colored in this place." I wanted to tell them we didn't come to buy colored, but that was another story. But they made make-shift arrangements for us to dine by setting up a table in the kitchen, where waiters and waitresses kept constantly coming by.

I sat there humiliated, demeaned, and brutalized simply because of the color of my skin and the texture of my hair--conditions over which I had no control. And when I thought about it, here we were, with our beautiful Brooks Brothers' suits on, Florsheim shoes, driving a new Buick, and having to sit in the kitchen of the restaurant. Something happened as we sat there. And as we were served, before we took a bit of food, somewhat simultaneously, all of us got up and walked back to the car and got in. Still hungry, not having eaten for almost ten hours, we were nevertheless happy because we had not yielded to this brutalization of our spirit. We rode down the highway, and started singing until our hunger passed: "My father is rich in houses and lands/He holds the wealth of this world in His hands/Of rubies and diamonds and silver and gold/His coffers are full/He has riches untold/And I'm a child of the King."

You may segregate it--men set me apart down here--but there's a day coming when I will inherit my kingdom prepared for me from before the foundation of the earth, and in Him there will be no east or west, north or south, male or female, black or white. I'm not hung up any longer on this question of color, because it dawned on me one day that as smart as I am, as brilliant as I am, as deceptive as I can be and on occasion tricky, if I were white, I'd be President of the United States of America!

But on the other hand, I came out of my office one day and saw a white gentleman who had his fill of ripple. This guy was dead drunk, stretched out in the snow, smiling, getting ready to go to sleep and maybe freezing to death. I thought, "Well how foolish I am to be hung up on the color question. For surely I might be President, but on the other hand, I could be the 'bum' lying in the street." So, I thank God I've conquered the whole concept of prejudice. I have no hatred in my heart for anybody no matter what color they are. It's a pragmatic reason also. I discovered that some folk hated the shadow I made when I walked along the street; and while they were having heart attacks and hypertension and high blood pressure, in those days, I could eat chitlings and tacos at midnight and go on to bed. And I discovered that hatred and contempt won't hurt folk, but it will kill you.

So, if I could use this anthropomorphic expression, if God were walking the streets of New York today, if he had a can of white paint in one hand and a can of black in the other, I would walk boldly up to God and say, "God, paint me black. But when you paint me black, give me a heart of love, justice, and understanding so I can look any man, any woman in the face. If they are on their way to heaven, tell them to go there; and if they are on their way to hell, tell them to go there. For, I understand now that fleecy locks and dark complexions do not forfeit nature's claims, that skins may differ, but

affections dwell in black and white the same."

If I could reach from pole to pole and grab the whole creation in my hands, I still must be measured by my mind and my heart and my soul, for that is the measure of a man. And understanding that, I make no apology for where the NAACP stands, saying that we have come from a long way, but we still have a long way to go, and too often the sharks are devouring the flesh of our catch.

Call it the big fish of equal opportunity employment. With Title Seven we thought: "Surely, now we'll be able to get the job that we deserve and that our talents demand for us." And then to our dismay and chagrin came the whole litany of "reverse discrimination" and "preferential treatment." People who had a loaf of bread under both arms all their lives somehow feel that God, by some divine decree, had mandated that white males between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five would have all the good jobs. If anybody else gets one, it's "reverse discrimination."

Surely, if I could make a simple parable, if there are 2,000 jobs available, and there are only 10,000 white males for these jobs, you have one chance in five. But if they open the door and say women can apply, and blacks can apply, and Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans and Indian Americans, then perhaps there'll be 14,000 people for those jobs. So mathematically, the chances for the white male getting it have been reduced, but that's not reverse discrimination, that's simply making things like they should have been all the time; and I think we've got to explain that.

The NAACP does not want to see unqualified people operating on you. But, I remind you that the American Medical Association said two years ago there were more than two million unnecessary cases of surgery performed in this nation that they had discovered. Qualified people--or people we have said are qualified--do some strange things. Only two percent of all the doctors in this nation are black and fewer are surgeons; and no way in the world can they take credit for those two million operations!

Then, Chief Justice Burger made the suggestion that, in his judgment, fifty percent of all the lawyers practicing were absolutely incompetent and incapable of representing anybody in a courtroom, anytime, at any place. Again, I don't want you to think he was talking about black folk. For blacks are only two percent of all the lawyers in this country. He was talking mainly about those white lawyers who came before him, and who probably were more inexperienced than they were grossly incompetent.

Now I want to talk about preachers. How many of you all are not qualified to preach? I don't know anything about that. I know one thing. Not one of you wants to stand or feel that way about yourself.

So, this matter of "qualification" is a lot of subjective nonsense. It's a smoke screen. It has been used to destroy the legitimate aspirations of people who are trying to make it. No group of folk in this world have been more loyal to the concept of democracy than black folk have; for we believed what you told us, that all of us are created equal. We held onto the dream through slavery, through second-class citizenship, through deprivation, and brutaliza-

tion. We have held on tenaciously to that dream, and we have become, as it were, the conscience of America calling you to remember. "Inasmuch as you do it unto the least of these, my little ones, you do it also even unto me" (Matthew 25:40 FT).

I thought we'd caught the big fish of equal housing with Title Three, and then came redlining and steering. We thought we'd caught the big fish of economic opportunity with the ten percent set-aside, then came the Fullilove case trying to destroy that. Everywhere we have caught the fish, but before we could get to the shore, the sharks have devoured the flesh; and, yet, we still believe that this line of ours will one day measure up, and, like the old man and the sea, we have faith. Therefore, we continued to fish even in this shark-infested sea in which we are called upon to apply our trade.

Look at our world today. Black joblessness is eleven percent compared to five-and-a-half for the white population--in the black teenage community, roughly from eighteen to twenty-four percent according to the U.S. Labor Department figures. More than thirty percent of black youth are unemployed and we know that in some urban areas across this nation, black youth unemployment soars well above fifty, sixty, seventy, and, even eighty percent in places like New York City, for example. It is difficult to build a race or a nation with that kind of massive deprivation. It ought to affect you, because as Reginald Jones, the president of General Electric has said on more than one occasion, "These young people constitute a ticking time bomb at the heart of the body of America."

One only has to go back and read the declining days of the Weimar Republic in Germany to see the rise of the power of Hitler when common, ordinary people had gotten tired of inflation and lawlessness and decided that there was a way to handle it; and that was to have a man on the white horse to come and restore order. And this mad man, in less than fourteen years in power, destroyed six million innocent people; and not only did he destroy them, but he made every German a virtual prisoner in his own home. You must understand that there's no way to have a concentration camp for a few folk without diminishing the liberties of all. And this liberty that we have in America is a fragile thing. It's a great thing. Nevertheless, it's fragile.

When we go back through all the history of civilization, only in a few times and places have people enjoyed the kinds of opportunities that we have in America. They have passed on to us a great legacy, a great heritage. Men and women, boys and girls died in order that we might be able to have the torch of freedom. We owe something to our posterity. If we plan to pass it on, we've got to be willing, sometimes, to face our neighbors and declare unto them that truth will always be truth and that it is wrong morally and legally to discriminate against people because of their race or their color or their creed or their religion or their sex. Somebody has to have the nerve to say that.

My hope for America in the eighties is that the great religious organizations carrying the banner of the Judeo-Christian heritage born in strife, coming out of many years of persecution, will have the ability to embrace the whole truth; that we'll be

willing if it means drinking from a bitter cup; if it means not being accepted on the golf course or being treated a little bit more in an unfriendly manner in our pulpits, that we must proclaim the truth that in Christ there is no east or west; that we must lift up the blood-stained banner of our Lord; that we must know that it is not enough to hide our Christianity within the cloistered walls of the sanctuary on Sunday and then mistreat people on Monday; that somehow the gospel we proclaim, the God we serve, is a God who demands of us no less than our best. If we can embrace that concept, we can stem the rising tide of conservatism and meanness in this country epitomized by Proposition Thirteen; epitomized by those who believe that poor women should be penalized and rich women have the choice of controlling their own bodies. The right-to-lifers want to see every baby born but do not have an equal commitment to making sure that every child is fed, clothed, and treated right. The right to life ought to include the right to live, and if we are not going to let babies live, then we ought to be less zealous about their being born.

We have problems that face us, but black folk, like Santiago, will use the weapons that they have; will take their harpoon, which is education--quality, integrated education; will take the knife and tie it to the oar, which means that we'll try to pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps even where there are few boots and no straps. Then, we'll resort, finally, to the short oars and the tillers which represent those white allies who have not deserted the cause, who in spite of ostracism, in spite of criticism, in spite of being talked about, have decided that they're going to take a stand on the side of right and righteousness, truth and justice.

And, so, I believe that America one day will yield its rich promises to all of its citizens. We must have jobs. We must conquer inflation. We must rid the city of these festering slums that create all kinds of dangerous conditions. We must be able to give to our young people a sense of belonging and equity and justice. We must be able to make our churches relevant to the lives of our communities. We must rid the cities of poverty and crime. We must rid our environment of pollution. We must be able to move forward and leave to those who come behind a legacy like we ourselves have been left.

Remember today, my friends, that black people started in 1619 in this nation, and we've been with you every step of the way. The British promised black folk freedom, if they would fight on their side in the Revolutionary War; but Washington heard it, and he promised freedom, so our feet froze in the snows of Valley Forge, but freedom we did not get. When Madison was run out of the White House in 1812, black soldiers helped put him back. In 1835, when Andrew Jackson stood victoriously at the second battle of New Orleans, black soldiers helped him raise that flag. In 1860, when this nation engaged in a Civil War to prove that a drop of blood weighed more than all the nation's gold, victory was not won until 300,000 black soldiers put on their uniforms and helped to make true that assertion. And in World War II, in Guadalcanal and Midway and Wake Island, the far-flung battlefields

of the world, black folk gave their lives, shed their blood, in order that this nation might stand.

We've knocked until our fingers are sore and bloody. We've knocked until our hearts are weary, our minds are numb, and now we're not saying for anybody to come down but we're saying in the name of truth and justice and love: "Move over because we're on our way, and we ain't going to let nobody turn us around."

This is our struggle. This is our fight. In love we will wage it. In love we shall fight it. Nonviolently we shall pursue it. And when it appears to you who try to help us--and I know that there are those of you who have been steadfast in your commitment and unshakable in your faith, and I know that you get tired of hearing black folk give you the devil every time they stand to speak, but there's somebody here who is on the mourner's bench that needs to hear the message of repentance and the gospel of salvation--and for them I bring this message. I tell you if you get tired of hearing it; if you become discouraged, remember how Churchill reached back and got the word of the ancient rabbi when the bombs were falling on Europe, when Britain was almost about to be destroyed, when every night it was ablaze, Churchill, that great word smith, had called upon the people of his country for blood, toil, tears, and sweat, to fight on the beaches and to fight everywhere. That night he got back on the radio and summoned those members of his country again to deport themselves with gallantry. He said, "I want you to so conduct yourselves that this beleaguered empire should endure for one thousand years. Historians would look back and say this was their finest hour. I call again upon you for blood, toil, tears, and sweat. We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds; we shall fight in the fields and in the streets; we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

And if you get tired and if you get weary and wonder why we should do it, remember if not you, who; if not now, when? Peace!

Personal Life Style: An Issue for the Eighties

Ramsey Clark

Life styles in the eighties. Words are difficult. Life style is a difficult phrase for me. It implies "far out," "hippie," "jet-set," and I aspired to both, frankly, but couldn't hack it. Too dull. Too conventional. So, I will work with life style in the way it has importance to me. Not style as fantasy, but style as the expression of inner self; as seeking for the truth in ourselves that can make us free.

The eighties, if I can foresee the future, will be a time of wildness beyond our experience, and, therefore, a time of profound testing, instability personal and instability societal. As Plato and Freud and Eric Fromm have told us in the former instance, personal instability, as have Epictetus, and Livy, and Gibbon, and Toynbee, and our own historians told us in the latter case of human

history, societal instability creates fear, self-centered concern, and emotional irrational reaction.

It's important, I think, to conjure up for a moment the possibilities of wildness. And I would hope that we could believe as we do that as Thoreau said in a not entirely different context, in wildness is the preservation of life. William Webster, the new director, the present director, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, observed last November that it is possible for anyone in this society who can read to enter a public library and obtain all information necessary to build a bomb that one can carry out on their back--an atom bomb. How many nations have it today? Three? Twelve? You guess. Skepticism is healthy, but you ignore actuality at your peril. More countries than we dare admit have the bomb. It's easy to build.

Terrorism, with all it implies about instability and the erosion of gentleness and humaneness, is in the ascendancy; and the dynamics that propel it are growing. There will be a billion more people on earth in ten years. Can we cope? Our knowledge of the physical universe, chemistry, microbiology, nuclear physics, and all the rest is doubling in six to eight years. It's a geometric progression. By the turn of the century, science will have unfolded, depending on your theory, discovered, invented, created a multiple of ten to fifteen times the present knowledge of our most advanced theoreticians, scholars, and researchers. And we haven't begun to address simple questions like the ethics of a life support system.

Hunger plagues the planet in numbers that exceed all history--if like Saroyan we perceive those numbers as one human being at a time; if we can see through the statistics that boggle the mind, that those units are individual human beings with souls as worthy as you or me or our children, or the person we cherish and love the most; the ignobility of starving to death, among a people who have the capacity to produce plenty; and the rage that it can cause, if we recognize, with Aristotle, the chief and universal cause of the revolutionary impulse is the desire for equality. Equality is the mother, if I can be sexist, of justice. If mother doesn't know the importance of equality, what happens to the next generation?

We've heard Helen Caldicott and others speak about what a nuclear blast would do to a city like this; how deep the hole would be; and how wide; and how many would be burned to death; and how far out the radiation would reach; and chance, having the last reaching blow at events, which way the cloud would move and who would be destroyed. We've come to a time when technology, which, if we have it, is our exercise of free will at a time when ninety-five percent of all the scientists who ever labored are working prodigiously under laboratory conditions far more conducive to invention than any of their predecessors. When technology which can liberate the human condition from its whole history of want manifests itself, they have the capacity to destroy us outright and indirectly in dozens of ways--many we see clearly, and many we barely perceive. The liberator can be the destroyer, and technology does not make moral judgments. It can't.

Poor Oppenheimer with all of his frustrations went to his grave understanding and

trying to tell us that the physical scientists have an obligation not to unleash on an unwilling humanity methods of destruction that social, legal, and political institutions can't control. Yet, we do it every day. New methods for killing.

Now, what does all this mean in terms of life style for the eighties? I think my major text will come today from the gospel according to Saint Pindar, the Greek poet, whom Herodotus of Halicarnassus loved so well. Herodotus would describe, and did describe, two cultures. One was Greek in the earlier time of Phillip the Second of Macedonia, where people who cared about the future thought deeply about how to treat those who passed on and built the elaborate tombs with all that you would need in the hereafter and buried it with them. Only last year we believe we found Phillip the Second's tomb--the wives, the servants, the animals, the wealth, all you need to wield the power you've wielded before. And then he talked of another culture that was thoughtful as to its future and believed with absolutely equal devotion that the only meaningful tribute to pay your ancestors to propagate their purpose was to eat them, so that they could become a part of your living mechanism and go on from generation to generation.

Now it's hard for us to analyze all that, but Pindar wrote a poem about it, and it includes this line that "Custom is lord of everything, of mortals and immortals king." Needless to say, the immortals were their religion. Still Pindar saw custom as king for people who've committed themselves to the life of religion, and it's hard to believe that all of the ideal and all of the purpose and all of the understanding can't come from the gospel. But finally, every creature is a creature of his culture to a considerable degree. We're conditioned from it, through it, by it, long before we can begin to see it, and as a man who delved deeply into the culture anthropology, most people are as unaware of their value patterns as they are the oxygen they breathe. That's why we can't confront a simple issue like capital punishment. It's just too simple. We desperately need the education and the obvious far more than examination of the obscure.

If you examine our society, you might see that two qualities dominate. They are deeply ingrained in our character. Whether we can ever extricate them entirely in generations is a real question that history hasn't answered. Whether we can even be aware of them involves the question of survival. And those two major qualities are our reverence for violence. We revere the power of violence constantly, daily, in a thousand ways we never think of. And we ignore its pity.

Just take our semantics. Anything we want to achieve is the war on poverty, battle for righteousness, arms, or force. And, perhaps, freedom is the negation of force. Yet our whole mentality, the most gentle and pacific and catholic (with a small "c") and humane among us, a Thoreau addressing the issue that he loved the most--freedom--says that America, we are told, is the arena; sangre arena in which the battle for freedom is to be fought.

There are societies that don't have a word for murder; that don't have a word for suicide, because the phenomena is unknown in their culture; because it hasn't happened. You have to have a word for what has happened,

so you can tell people about it.

We need people who can detect within themselves the germ of inarticulate truth; who won't be swept away by the dominate culture that doesn't finally give you time to think; who will understand the violence that we revere and see it as the ultimate human degradation. "Walk softly and carry a big stick," an old West African proverb Teddy Roosevelt used, by which he meant: "I'll smash your head with this club if you don't do what I say, quietly."

It came from Owen Wister in a way--The Virginian, the hero, the model, and the villain, Trampas, and the poker game. The villain calls the hero, the Virginian, a bad name; and the Virginian, to show his righteousness, slips his Colt 45 from his belt and under his shirt where he had it hidden and lays it on the table and says, "When you call me that, smile, or I'll shoot your heart out." Because right makes might, and right is my revolver, and I've got it pointed at you.

Look around the world today. We're building three bombs a day. Where within the dominate culture patterns will you find the capacity to resist that? After Afghanistan, when the President of the United States announced a five percent increase in the military budget, you know what the military budget is; well, it's better than twenty-five percent of the total federal expenditure. See any old folks that need a hand lately? Visited any malnutrition? Know any of the ten to twelve million school-age children in America that have serious learning disabilities, can't read? Think those are problems that might relate to the strength of this society? Do we believe somehow or other that a nation that is already spending one-third of all the world spends on methods of destruction can find greater security in increasing that security when we have the capacity to destroy all life that God gave us many times over?

But then finally come to the area of most importance--research and development. And that's not a mere five percent increase. That's a twenty-one percent increase. For what? For more sophisticated methods of quickly and efficiently killing people. That's what it's for.

Even if you live in a we-they world, as our culture tells us to do, a world where there are good people like you and me--not being too sure about you in every case--and the bad people like them--whether they are the poor in the ghetto that mug us at night, or whether they are the Russians in all their madness and evil--the good people have to prevail. And because the bad people use force, the good people have to have a superior capacity for it.

Even if you believed that finally, how do you rationalize more research and development for methods of killing when we have MIRV and how many other systems? Do you know what creepy-crawlies are? You know what slickems and glickems are? Missiles from submerged launchings, missiles from land launchings, and mobile missiles, and all the rest are capable of incinerating a quarter of a million people in an instant. They mutate genes and chromosomes and all the rest and cause slow death for how many and cancer and everything else.

Where will we find the truth that Saint John promised from the dominant culture that

glorifies the power of violence? Why does America watch professional football by the millions and millions every Saturday? And how different is that from the coliseum and the gladiators? What's the margin, the degree? I am asking you about something that I still get a particular feel for when I get a football in my hand. I always thought I could throw it a little farther and a little straighter than anybody else. But I grew up with guns, too. I had a 22 rifle when I was nine. A 410 shotgun when I was ten. And let me tell you, my culture taught me to love them. It really did. The craftsmanship, the perfection, the sense of my capacity to extend myself through them, to kill that dove, to shoot that rabbit, and what else?

And finally we have a society with hundreds of weapons killing itself daily twenty thousand times a year over, overwhelmingly from arguments where mental health is broken down and from within families among people who know each other well. If you don't want to be murdered, two bits of advice that are absolutely sound. Have no friends, and stay away from your family. I kid you not. It will increase your safety by a mathematical margin that you wouldn't believe.

Find happiness? That's another problem. Maybe whiskey will do it. We are a drug culture. We have to have the will, and we have to find it from people with a very elemental life style of their own who've thought things through and are ready to choose. Life is choice. Today I stand prepared to say, "We should today unilaterally dismantle half of our nuclear arms and then we could just kill the rest of them and ourselves too twenty times over, not forty anymore, because we would be safer the moment we did it." If that sounds crazy, then ask yourself what we're going to do by the year 2000 when no fewer than twenty-five to thirty nations will have the bomb, and it will have been for a long period an easy access to terrorists. Do terrorists have the will? Let me tell you. They are very willful people. They are true believers in the most elemental sense.

We need people with an elemental life style that will say, "I recognize I cannot work in the napalm factory all week and march in the peace parade on Sunday." You can't make the world safe for hypocrisy. America has something better to offer the world than more arms, and I insist that we start in an orderly way to convert from a permanent war economy which will inevitably lead us to war. You create a mobile strike force, and you know what it'll do? It'll strike mobily.

That would have been great in the Persian Gulf. Logistically, it's impossible to win. Anyone, Mercator or anyone who ever looked at a map, knows that. It's too far away. It's too close to other places. If we could win there, then we never had a risk anyway because, we could easily prevail by force alone, anyplace on the globe.

We need people who'll recognize that when you start talking about drafting women, you are witnessing the seduction of feminism by militarism in the name of equality, but it ain't so. It can only lead to equal injustice under law, and humanity has to aspire to something better.

It was Euripides who told us "the gods of war hate those who hesitate." He also gave

us Lysistrata who said "feminism is more than the care for half the population; it's the care for all the population." It's this care to preserve society which is the source of all law--Hugo Grotius--the law of war and peace. It's a recognition that in militarism there is destruction.

We have to put away our guns. We ought to prohibit, we ought to abolish, the handgun as a killer weapon, concealable and dangerous; something that has affected our history, how many times over? Because, it has killed so many of the people that embodied the better dream of our society. What possible justification do those who love children have for the handgun? How many tombstones are there of people who thought they could protect themselves by the handgun?

But, finally, people who think they must protect themselves, recognize they live in a jungle; there's not an ordered society that can protect them. It requires the individual capacity for violence in your own self-interest.

Materialism. We love things. In large part, we have cherished the Shah. We loved his violence. But above all we loved his jet-set style, his enormous richness, all those glamorous women, and the power that he manifested. We loved to be transported to Persepolis and eat caviar under the canvas with him; and we never questioned 100,000 political prisoners when Amnesty International and others told us they were being tortured; their bones, and bodies and spirits broken.

If the rest of the world began to aspire to things as we do; if they wanted to consume energy at the rate we want to; if they believed as Mark Twain suggested that the American people believed that civilization is nothing but the proliferation of unnecessary necessities, another electrical gadget every day; that joy and life depend upon acquisition of a new suit, a new car, a new home, and on and on--where is virtue in all that? Where is love in all that? And finally, where is the possibility of survival in all of that?

We need a life style that will bring us people like Jack Tanner who find the true joy of life being involved in a cause you yourself deem mighty; being a force of nature; being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap heap; being something more than a feverish, selfish little clod of ailments and grievances, complaining that the world won't devote itself to making you happy. What did gold do today? How are my investments?--when I know, as I lay my head on the pillow tonight, that a third of the world goes to bed hungry and millions are physically wasting.

We need a bold, new life style, in a time of unprecedented turbulence, that finds the willingness in a society that thinks it's soft to speak of gentleness. If you looked at Robert Kennedy's public utterances as recorded, and I believe it's truer in his private utterances, for the last six months of his life, he didn't go a thousand words without saying "gentle." He couldn't keep himself from patting a dog or embracing a child, because he had watched John and Medgar and Martin and others wasted by the violence in our society. He knew what it promised; and, in his case, it fulfilled its promise--society revering violence and cherishing ma-

terial things, that led to his murder. Not some foreign conspiracy--you get all the Sicilians and put them on a boat and send them back toward Messina and sink it, and we'll all live happily ever after.

Our values. We're the luckiest people who ever lived. We have the capacity abundantly and manifestly to solve all of our problems, if we have the will. If we can renounce violence; if we can cherish that person who hears a different drummer and who marches to different music, however far away or distant; and finally, if we can believe one thing, and that is that not only a life of principle is possible, but nothing else is worthwhile.

If we can have one single faith, we'll more than survive, we'll prevail. And the faith is the faith that Abraham Lincoln urged in a speech that he made in this town at what he called the Cooper Institute in February of 1860. He worked for weeks on it personally in the library in Springfield and up in Chicago and finally here. He had a naive idea that what the Founding Fathers (no mothers--you see things weren't perfect then, either)--that what the Founding Fathers thought about the subject of expansion of slavery into the free territories might be relevant to constitutional government. So, he wanted to know what each of the thirty-three said on the subject, and he went as far as recorded history would permit and found what fifteen thought. And the poor man meticulously tried to identify what each of them thought as if it had any relevance to the irreconcilable conflict that was to be the Civil War, testing whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. And he ended his speech with one thought. It's the thought that is essential to the eighties for each individual, a life style patterned on this thought. And when you say it, it seems so unrealistic that people think, "Not possible." And it's this: "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith, let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

The Prospects for Peace: International Issues in the Eighties

Kurt Waldheim

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kind words of introduction and I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for giving me the opportunity to talk to you this afternoon. It is, indeed, a great pleasure for me to be with you as I know what you are doing and I highly appreciate the fact that you are organizing this seminar of the Southern Baptist Christian Life Commission. I think this is exactly what we need in the United Nations. I think your interest and your search for a peaceful solution to the problems of the world today are extremely important.

That is exactly what we try to achieve in the United Nations--a peaceful solution of the great problems of the world. But it is getting more and more difficult. This year didn't really start well and we are concerned about it. The last year was very bad as well. If I speak as Secretary-General of the United Nations to you, I have to acknowledge

that it was not a peaceful year.

It appeared that we had nothing but trouble in the world. There were regional conflicts; we had the development in Iran; the developments in Afghanistan; human rights violations. We had problems wherever we looked. And, unfortunately, the beginning of this year didn't really bring a change for the better. On the contrary, the situation deteriorated: the hostage problem in Iran, the situation in Indochina, the grim aftermath of the war last year and a continuation of old problems in the humanitarian field.

So this is the situation we face at the beginning of this year. The policy of détente, which means better understanding amongst nations, suffered a very serious blow. The relationship between the two superpowers has worsened considerably. But I tell you quite frankly that I do not believe in a big power confrontation. I do not believe in the outbreak of the Third World War in the near future, as some of the media are telling us.

There was a sort of war hysteria at the beginning of this year. I do not think we should accept it. I believe that the leaders of the world are still reasonable enough to avoid war and discourage a war psychosis. I suppose we all realize what a war would mean in the nuclear age. It would mean a nuclear war and we are fully aware that there can be no winners, but only losers. And maybe this gives us a chance if the powers are reasonable enough to avoid such a confrontation.

We have to make our contribution. We have to do everything in our power in order to calm the situation. In the media, all kinds of doomsday statements are made. They sometimes give the impression that the next war is approaching and is inevitable. I wish to tell you that I certainly do not share those views.

And let me say here that the United Nations has certainly contributed to a development which gives us a chance to avoid a military confrontation on a large scale; in other words, a worldwide confrontation. We are a sort of safety valve which is luckily used again and again by the nations of the world. Of course, you will ask, "But have you really solved the problems of the world?" No, we have not. Sometimes we succeed; very often we do not.

Well, let me say here, in all frankness, that the reason for some of the failures of our organization is not that the organization doesn't work. It is the selfishness of sovereign states that do not look to the future but are solely concerned with their own national interests. They want to get what they want from their point of view. Whether big or small, they are guided by what they perceive as their short-term interests.

Indeed, this comment does not apply to the big powers alone. It applies as well to the many middle-size and smaller countries locked in their own conflicts. It is not that I want to defend the big powers, but I just want to say that narrow self-interest is in the foreground of the thinking of states today. They do not consider what will happen in the future. They do not consider the long-term interest of humanity. This is regrettable, because, really, we have to look to the future. We should avoid concentrating

on our own national interests and look at the interests of the world community.

Very often, the United Nations is seized with problems much too late. We cannot really use our means of preventive diplomacy if we are not given a chance to do so. Still, occasions arise when we play a very useful role in preventive diplomacy. However, our problem is that if and when such preventive diplomacy works, nobody knows about it because the conflict doesn't break out and nobody realizes that there was this danger. Nobody, therefore, gives us credit for having made our contribution in averting a conflict. On the other hand, if it does not work, if the conflict does break out, then, of course, people criticize the United Nations and say, "Look, here we are again; the United Nations is just a talking shop, nothing comes out of it," et cetera. I know you wouldn't say this, but many newspapers and other media like to make such statements without pondering how difficult, how complex the work of the United Nations is.

Let's be frank. There were too many expectations in 1945 when the UN was established. People thought at that time, and maybe some of you (why not?) that it was the solution for the future. They expected that whenever there would be conflict or tension, or even war would break out, the United Nations would come in as a sort of world government and solve the problem.

This was a completely wrong concept right from the beginning. The United Nations is definitely not a world government. I am not the Prime Minister of a world government. We are without executive power. I am the Secretary-General of an inter-government organization with no executive power. We have to rely on the goodwill of the member states in order to solve our problems. Even if the Security Council makes a decision, in one way or another the implementation depends on the member states. They have to implement those resolutions and if they don't, well, it doesn't work.

Now you can say, "Why don't you enforce your decisions?" Well, there is something in the Charter which says that in case of such situations, enforcement measures can be applied. But, again, that is possible only if the Security Council decides on such measures. And it needs the consent of all permanent members of the Council who are the five big powers. Now, you can imagine how difficult it is to get these five together to agree on something. This is because when you have a regional conflict or a case like that of Afghanistan or Indochina or Cambodia, or the Middle East, for instance, the interests of the big powers--we call them more elegantly the permanent members of the Security Council--diverge from one another. One supports one side; the other supports the other side. So, how can they agree in the Security Council on enforcement measures which mean military action against one or the other state? There is only one example in the history of the United Nations where such enforcement action has been decided by the Security Council and that was the Korean War. On that occasion, one big power had left its seat unoccupied in the Council. It was in its absence that the remaining permanent members of the Council decided on such a military operation. That was the beginning of the Korean War. I don't have to tell you about what happened after this decision had

been taken.

This makes it clear that there is little possibility to enforce the decisions of our organization. Whether it is the Security Council or the General Assembly, we have to rely on the goodwill of the membership; we have to rely on the goodwill of the governments concerned. Very often, this goodwill does not exist. I am sorry to say this, but it is a fact. As your distinguished chairman said a moment ago, I am in this job in the ninth year now and I know what I am talking about. Maybe I had some illusions in the beginning. But, after more than eight years, I must say that there is definitely a lack of cooperation with the United Nations from its member states.

However, fortunately, there is enough encouragement. I once said my job is a mixture of frustration and satisfaction because very often we are encouraged by the support we get from the public, from private organizations like yours. This is enormously important. And let me say one thing here. The Charter of the United Nations does not speak of governments: it speaks of the people of the world, and I think this is good and most appropriate.

I think no government can really do a good job without the support of the people, whether here in your country or in any other country of the world. And for us in the United Nations, it is exactly the same. We need the support of the people. We need the support of private citizens. You can say, "Yes, but in what way? Only through non-governmental organizations, et cetera?" No, what I mean is that you and all the other private organizations in the world can influence the attitude of their governments through their expression of will, of what they want their government to do. Governments, especially in a democracy, have to rely on the wishes of their people. If it is the wish of their people to use the international machinery for peace and international cooperation, to use it even more than it has been done in the past, well, the governments will have to do it. So, the work of non-governmental organizations is extremely important for us in the United Nations.

I am, indeed, grateful to the religious organizations of this great country, the United States, for the work they are doing. I can tell you, it is heartwarming for me to see their enthusiasm, their support for us in the United Nations and elsewhere, for international cooperation in general and for what is so important, peaceful solutions of the problems of the world.

You can hear here and there, "Well, now we have enough. Let's use force. Let's do this or that by force." Well, that won't solve the problem, ladies and gentlemen. I think we should be aware of this. Again, in the nuclear age, force cannot solve problems. It can only destroy humanity. So, I am, indeed, most appreciative of the support your organization and each and every one of you is giving us in our efforts to achieve peaceful solutions of the great problems of our time.

Earlier, I talked about a mixture of frustration and satisfaction. Well, one of the frustrations for me is quite clearly the fact that we were unable until now to achieve the release of the American hostages in Iran. I am deeply worried about this. I feel sorry for the families of these poor hostages, and

I wish to assure you that we have done everything possible in order to solve the problem. I shall continue to do so in the future. I am quite confident that the problem will be solved; it is only a question of time. But this is one of the frustrations which, believe me, I am the first one to suffer from. It is not our fault. You know very well what is going on. There is a complex situation in that country. The fact is that we negotiate agreements which are then not kept because those with whom we negotiate do not have the power to implement such agreements. These are the real problems we have to face in this situation.

But let me also say that there are some encouragements in my life. For instance, three years ago--it was on Christmas Eve--after a year-long process of negotiations, I was able to achieve the release of a dozen French hostages somewhere in Africa and I was invited or requested by those people to come to a certain place in Africa to pick them up personally and to take them home. And I shall never forget that moment when I finally arrived in a special aircraft in Paris in Orly Airport, and I saw the families of these hostages, and I could hand over the hostages to their mothers, to their husbands, to their children. It was a heart-warming situation, just on Christmas Eve, to see these poor people united with their families again. Well, this does encourage me. It shows that our work is not in vain and that there is a chance to make our contribution to the solution of the problems of our time, whether in the field of human rights or in that of political affairs or in the economic and social sphere.

Again, many thanks for giving me the chance to talk to you today, to give you a glimpse of our work, our preoccupations and difficulties. Thank you again for everything you are doing in order to help us. I wish you good luck for your further efforts and full success.

Church-State Issues in the Coming Decade

John M. Swomley, Jr.

"The Constitution of the United States," wrote the historian Charles A. Beard, "does not confer upon the federal government any power whatever to deal with religion in any form or manner. The only references to religion in the Constitution restrict the government in legislating or otherwise dealing with religion or religious organizations."

In my remarks about church-state issues in the 1980s I shall adopt a strict or literal interpretation of the Constitution. The First Amendment states that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. And since the Fourteenth Amendment and the Everson case, all of the states are bound by that same restriction.

All Americans owe a debt of gratitude to Roger Williams, and to many Baptists from that day to this, in promoting and defending the concept of separation of church and state. We also owe a debt to John Locke whose philosophy was a strong influence on

Jefferson, Madison, and many other leading Americans. Partly under his influence, they came to believe that a government that was formed by a social contract had no power given to it whatever to act on religious matters.

There is an unfortunate impression in many circles today that we are not likely to have any serious church-state problems in the 1980s because the Supreme Court has dealt with most of the important issues or has, at least, laid down the major guidelines for dealing with them. There is another unfortunate impression that the church-state problems of the eighties will be almost exclusively religious liberty issues wherein churches and religious minorities must be protected from government regulations or government intrusions. Both of these impressions are, in my judgment, incorrect.

Let me list some of the reasons for believing that we shall continue to have major church-state problems, including establishment of religion cases in the eighties. The two groups that have by political pressures created most of the establishment clause issues are fellow Christians: the Roman Catholic hierarchy and certain sectarian Protestant groups.

First of all, the majority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy has never accepted the American idea set forth by Jefferson that no tax, large or small, should be levied on anyone forcing him or her to support either the religion of others or "to support this or that teacher of his persuasion." Few Catholics or Protestants know the magnitude of government funding of the Catholic church.

The editor of the National Catholic Reporter, an excellent paper, wrote, "Nearly fifty percent, a conservative national estimate, of diocesan Catholic charities' annual budgets is government money. Dioceses that once had huge infrastructures for Catholic schools are developing infrastructures to staff government-funded social service programs. Some dioceses have set up separate corporations to handle government moneys. . . . Jesuit universities and colleges in this country in the year 1976-77 raised \$40 million in private money and \$94 million in government funds, plus \$35 million (from government funds) in student aid."

When the National Conference of Catholic Charities met in Kansas City in 1979, a spokesperson referred to the continuing contacts that they maintain with each administration in order to continue their funding. "Five hundred and fifty agencies receive forty-five percent of their funding from governmental units." Hundreds of millions of dollars have gone to parochial schools since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Pope has specifically asked Roman Catholic churches to secure government funds for their parochial schools. The Administrative Board of the U.S. Catholic Conference in a major statement on political issues for the 1980s gave priority to a government-aid program for parochial schools and to the passage of an amendment dealing with abortion. A special office has been set up in Washington to mobilize and channel Catholic pressure on Congress with respect to these issues.

In the second place, the growth of non-Catholic, chiefly sectarian Protestant schools has eroded the opposition in some quarters to aid to parochial schools. The

self-interest of some religious groups in getting government money has made them abandon their zeal for separation of church and state.

In the third place, there is scarcely a state that has not been besieged by sectarian groups with requests for some kind of prayer in the public schools. The New York Times reported on January 24 that sixteen evangelical preachers who reach millions of Americans through their television ministries have organized to encourage their viewers to put pressure on Congress to support the Jesse Helms bill that would forbid federal courts to review any case related to prayer in the public schools.

Fourth, is the Supreme Court's own rationalization of aid to church colleges. In a 1976 decision, Roemer vs. Board of Public Works, the Court by a five-to-four vote upheld the constitutionality of a Maryland law authorizing an annual subsidy to private, including church, colleges, so long as the state funds were not used for sectarian purposes. The Court found that the colleges involved were not "pervasively sectarian," but performed "essentially secular functions"; however, a number of classes at the college were begun with prayer. The Court justified such a practice on the grounds that the prayers were left to the discretion of each teacher and none of the colleges had a policy of requiring prayer. The colleges also had religious symbols, and some teachers wore clerical garb in the classroom.

In an earlier case, Tilton vs. Richardson, the Court permitted aid even though theology courses were compulsory at each of the institutions. In the Tilton case the Court justified, in part, the teaching of religion on the grounds that these courses were taught as academic subjects; and academic freedom was allowed in the non-theology courses. Under the Roemer decision payments of salaries to instructors of secular subjects may be made from state funds even to pay clergy teaching those subjects. The Supreme Court, in other words, has now established the precedent that religion and theology classes are severable from the rest of a college's activities; that religious symbols and clerical garb in the classroom are not a bar to state aid; and that the reporting to a government agency by the college of its use of the money is not excessive government entanglement.

A prestigious law firm, retained by the U.S. Catholic Conference, is working to try to extend the Court's principles in these college cases to elementary and secondary schools. Basically the thrust of that firm is that each parochial school is different; that it is not possible to say that all parochial schools are pervasively sectarian; and that it is possible to provide state funds to institutions where the religion classes are severable from the secular subjects taught in the parochial schools.

Let me now turn to the major church-state problems in the eighties which I think can be classified roughly under ten categories.

First is the effort to nullify the Supreme Court decision with respect to prayer in the public schools by forbidding federal court review of any case related to prayers in those schools. As you know, the Supreme Court did not forbid voluntary prayer by any child during school hours. It did forbid school-sponsored or structured periods of

prayer or worship. The effort by Senator Helms, whose bill has passed the Senate, and by Representative Philip Crane, to force the bill out of the House Judiciary Committee, is therefore an attempt to permit states to reinstate school-sponsored prayers. The ethical problem in the Helms bill is that of hamstringing or destroying an independent judiciary. If the people permit Congress to stifle judicial review of violations of their religious liberty, it will be possible to bar the courts from considering violations of any other freedom Americans enjoy. The ethical problem involved in school-sponsored prayers is that of religious groups pressuring legislatures to coerce children of differing religious faiths or none into prayer, thus making a mockery both of prayer and of a religion that would use such coercion on children.

The second main category of church-state problems is aid to parochial and other religious schools. The chief federal proposals are sponsored by Senator Moynihan. One is tuition tax credits; the other is an amendment which would extend the basic educational opportunity grants for colleges to private elementary and secondary schools.

There are a number of ethical problems connected with tuition tax credits. First, the tuition tax credit approach is one of using parents as a conduit of tax aid to the parish church and parish school. Father Bredeweg of the National Catholic Educational Association told the House Ways and Means Committee, "The Catholic schools have been subsidized by the parish. We have increasing costs and have to switch from parish subsidy to increasing tuition charges. This tuition tax credit will enable us to increase the tuition somewhat to meet the rising costs, but at the same time make this parish switch.

Second, the history of tax credits is the use of them as a device to induce an investment in an institution or endeavor for which the credit is offered. For example, business enterprises are offered credits for purchasing new equipment which in turn is intended to increase employment. The use of tax credits to assist sectarian schools would encourage enrollment in such schools both by its tax advantage and by the belief that the state would be assuming increasing responsibility for their finances. It is a rather generous offer to have the government coerce the taxpaying public to pay half the cost of tuition for those who send their children to exclusive private schools.

Third, tax credits are discriminatory. The fact that a head of a family must wait for a tax credit or refund until income-tax time means that he or she must have enough money for tuition in September and subsequent months but be able to wait until April or May for reimbursement. The poor who now send their children to tuition-free church school or to schools that charge only a nominal fee would no longer have that privilege. Tax credits will lead churches that now charge no tuition for their schools to do so. Tax credits are also discriminatory in that a family with an income of \$50,000 might receive \$750.00 for three children in private school, whereas a family with income of \$10,000 or \$20,000 and three children in public schools would not get a dollar. Moreover, the United States Office of Education in 1971 estimated the operating cost of non-public schools at \$4.7 billion; it is far greater than that to-

day. If the bulk of that comes from tuition in the future, thousands of well-to-do taxpayers will be saving between \$250 and \$1,000 in taxes which millions of other taxpayers must pay for them.

The third major church-state problem of the eighties is the threat of a Constitutional amendment intended to overturn the Supreme Court decision on abortion. However, not one of the amendments mentions the word "abortion." Instead, all of the amendments propose wording which would write into the Constitution a uniquely Roman Catholic medical ethic. There are two types of proposed amendments. One of these says that, "Every human being subject to the jurisdiction of these United States or of any state shall be deemed from the moment of fertilization to be a person and entitled to the right to life." The second proposes that, "The word 'person' as used in this article and in the Fifth and Fourteenth Articles of Amendment to this Constitution applies to all human beings including their unborn offspring at every state in their biological development.

The idea that a person exists at conception is a product of a specific religious faith. It is intended not only to prohibit all abortion, but contraceptive birth control devices such as the IUD and morning-after pill which operate after conception. The proposed amendments equate the life of an hour-old or day-old zygote or week-old embryo, as well as a fetus with the life of a mother. They follow the teachings of Pius XII, who in 1951 said, "The unborn child is a human being in the same degree and by the same title as its mother; so to save the life of the mother is a most noble end, but the direct killing of the unborn child as a means to that end is not lawful." This means that for the sake of a religious principle it is better for both mother and fetus to die than it is to save the life of the mother through a direct abortion.

Those who have been unable to get a constitutional amendment through Congress are now seeking a constitutional convention. Eighteen states have now joined in such a call. The most serious thing that has happened in any state legislature calling for a constitutional convention thus far occurred in Massachusetts. Some legislators there, who became concerned about the dangers of such a convention, tried to amend the resolution so as specifically to eliminate the Bill of Rights from consideration by a constitutional convention. That amendment was defeated. So we can say that in a state where the Right to Life Movement and its religious backers are very strong, there was a definite strategy to leave open the possibility of revising the Bill of Rights.

The fourth major church-state issue revolves around the old controversy about evolution. Recently a bill in the Georgia legislature proposed that scientific creationism be taught in the public schools if evolution is taught. The language of the Georgia bill defined creationism as the theory that "All matter, energy, and life and their processes and relationships were created ex nihilo and fixed by creative and intelligent design." This is a traditional, orthodox Christian position on which there are widely different views today.

One of the religious objections to making creationism a required part of the science curriculum is that it would require teaching

a faith statement from the Bible as if it were a scientific theory. If the Genesis story were put to the same examination as other theories, it would be exposed to analysis and possible ridicule. For example, one Genesis story which is preferred by creationist societies has God creating vegetables and fruit trees before he created the sun to make it warm enough for them to survive. Biblical creation is a supernatural doctrine that presupposes a creator. That doctrine is empirically unverifiable. It is, as the book of Hebrews says, a faith statement, "By faith we understand the world was created by the word of God." Coercing people who do not accept that faith into taking such a course in the public schools would be a violation of their religious liberty.

By the same token, if one sectarian teaching is adjudged by the legislature to be scientific and legitimate classroom activity, then other religious groups should expect to have their interpretations regarding the origin of life and other matters also considered. One of the major reasons for opposing a scientific creationist bill is that if such a measure were adopted, it would establish a precedent for other groups to make their beliefs a part of the curriculum. Is there, nevertheless, a way for the creation story to be considered in the public schools? Apparently this is quite possible, if not taught as science, but in a class of comparative religion wherein different faith approaches to creation and other matters are considered.

A fifth church-state issue of the 1980s is the expansion of government regulations that impinge on the free exercise of religion. Before 1969, no religious organization, including religiously affiliated organizations, had to file an annual financial report with the Internal Revenue Service.

In 1969 Congress adopted a limited exemption. There was an exemption for church conventions and associations of churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and the exclusively religious activities of religious orders. But Congress did not define these terms. This left to IRS and the Treasury Department the decision as to what Congress meant by such a term as "integrated auxiliaries."

The IRS decided by issuing regulations that church schools, hospitals, and other charitable and welfare organizations are not churches or integrated auxiliaries of churches. One implication of the IRS decision is that federal administrative agencies can determine that some institutions are genuinely religious, while others are only somewhat religious. The IRS decided that certain church agencies do not have an exclusively religious purpose. To have an exclusively religious purpose, an organization must "provide spiritually oriented or morally oriented instruction directly to the people it is set up to serve." Such groups as the Southern Baptist Convention's Annuity Board and Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota have been defined by IRS as non-exclusively religious.

A second implication is that a government agency can decide which agencies are and which are not integral parts of churches. One point of view with respect to all this is that if Congress had not provided tax exemption or tax benefits to religious organizations it could not constitutionally decide which organizations are religious enough to

qualify for tax exemption. The American Civil Liberties Union, for example, holds that Congress was given no power to legislate such tax exemption because it cannot make any law respecting an establishment of religion.

A second point of view held by many in the churches and government is that the government does have the right to grant various exemptions to religious organizations and therefore it must be able to distinguish between religious claimants. Are all who claim to be religious actually religious? Is it possible to create a state church and gain ministers for it by advertising ordination for a \$10.00 fee with the inducement that such ordained ministers can get draft deferment or tax exemptions for their homes if they conduct a Sunday service in them and claim them as a combination church-parsonage? Can a massage parlor incorporate as a temple of divine love and claim to be a religious organization?

Religious exemptions are impossible without some definition of religion that can be stated in legal formulas. Some religious groups, notably Baptists, Quakers, Seventh Day Adventists and Jews learned long ago that the fewer privileges they ask or accept for themselves from government, the less government intrusion.

Another type of case involves the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which required certain church agencies to provide records on the race, sex, and salaries of employees so as to decide whether they were victims of discrimination. A federal court in Fort Worth ruled that the EEOC did not have such jurisdiction over a Baptist seminary. A Presbyterian college in Grove City, Pennsylvania refused to submit certain forms to EEOC, even though that Commission threatened students enrolled in the college would lose all federal aid, including GI Bill benefits. A federal court sustained the school.

But what about a church that has consistently backed the right of employees to form labor unions and the right of the National Labor Relations Board to supervise employee balloting to decide whether to organize a union? May the NLRB, when requested by Catholic lay teachers according to law, supervise such an election in Catholic schools? The American Civil Liberties Union holds that the mere supervision of an election is not the point at which there is a church-state problem; but if the NLRB tried to intervene in any religious issue such as the dismissal of an employee because of heresy, it would be violating the church's religious liberty. A number of Protestant groups and Americans United, however, supported the Catholic bishops in opposing NLRB jurisdiction on the ground that it had no right to intervene in a church organization. The Supreme Court upheld the bishops, but not on constitutional grounds, so that the question will almost certainly come up again.

A sixth category of church-state cases is protection of the rights of religious minorities. This includes such items as whether new or unpopular religious groups may solicit funds or members; whether they may use public facilities on the same basis as long-established churches; whether their converts are to be free from parental kidnapping and deprogramming. Included under this category would be the takeover by the Attorney General of California of the Worldwide Church of God

on the mere allegation of six disfellowshipped members that there were financial irregularities in the expenditures of church funds. There was no notice to church authorities of the court proceedings from which came the order to a court-appointed receiver to "take possession and control of the church, including all its assets," and to "suspend or terminate any employee, officer, or agent of the church in his sole discretion as he deems necessary."

A seventh category of church-state problems is the maintenance of the religious character of church-related institutions which rely on public funds. Justice Stevens in his dissent in the Roemer case stated, "I would add emphasis to the pernicious tendency of a state subsidy to tempt religious schools to compromise their religious mission without wholly abandoning it." This can be illustrated in a Kansas case, Americans United vs. Bubb. Five Kansas colleges were ruled ineligible for state tuition educational grants; one because it favored Missouri Synod Lutheran students in admissions, three for compulsory chapel; and one because it required an expression of faith in an oral exam before graduation. These five colleges all abandoned these religious requirements in order to qualify for state aid.

An eighth category of church-state problems relates to federal intervention in states which have strict constitutional provisions against aid to religious agencies. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended in 1974 permits the U.S. Commissioner of Education to bypass state departments of education in public school districts to provide services to parochial school students on an equitable basis when it is prohibited by (state) law.

In Missouri parochial school administrators have asked the U.S. Office of Education to provide funds for parochial school students for special reading and other instruction for educationally disadvantaged students in low-income areas. A special corporation which had been set up and sponsored by a church is receiving and channeling such aid. Dr. Hugh Wamble of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary is handling this case as his own attorney in order to establish that the Bypass Provision is unconstitutional under the First and the Tenth Amendments.

Under the Bypass Provision the U.S. Office of Education contracts with a private, not-for-profit corporation which hires teaching personnel and sends them into parochial schools to provide instructional services during regular school hours. The funds are taken from the federal funds allocated to the public school district before any funds are sent to that public school district.

The ninth category of church-state cases has to do with religious symbols on public property. Let me quote from a Jewish publication: "Although it may be a technical violation of the separation principle for a village to erect its traditional Christmas tree in the public square each December, there is probably no court in the land that would prohibit this. And the number of Jews who find such a practice truly objectionable is probably very small indeed. A nativity scene on the public school lawn, however, is quite another matter, particularly if it were coupled with a beautiful, deeply Christological Christmas program. Jews do not seek

to undermine Christianity, but neither do they wish their impressionable young children to be enticed into what may appear to be the official state religion." The same problem exists with Christmas observances in the public schools.

There isn't time to deal with all of the church-state issues we shall face in the eighties, such as the following: May public utilities donate money to religious organizations and pass the cost on to their customers? Should radio and TV stations be compelled to give a portion of public service broadcasting time to religious broadcasters? May the government which is cutting down on social services in order to channel money into an already overloaded military engage in public referral to religious social welfare agencies? May it pay a percentage of the church agency's budget? May the government which operates seventy-seven compulsory boarding schools for Indian children, force them to state their religious preference, to attend chapel? May the government provide school buildings for religious purposes? May the CIA use ministers or missionaries to serve CIA purposes, and thus jeopardize the churches' foreign mission?

I close on a personal note. In 1966 I was speaking at a conference in Brussels and in the audience was the man who, next to Martin Niemöller, led the church resistance to Adolph Hitler. His name is Hans Kloppenburg. He asked if I would go to East Berlin to speak to the Minister of Church-State Affairs in East Germany. The problem, he said, is that the Communist government there believes that both the East German church and the West German church are a tool of the American church, following its lead, and that the American church is a tool of American imperialism. He also asked me if I would try to change the man's mind. I accepted the challenge and went with him.

In the course of the discussion, I asked the Minister of East German Church Affairs how the church had progressed under his leadership, whether it had grown less conservative and so on. He responded to question after question for a half hour, and then, as I had hoped, he turned to me and said, "And what about the church in the United States?" And I was able to tell him that more than 50,000 churchpersons had been in jail during the whole of the Civil Rights campaign in resistance to the United States and to state governments. I was able to tell him that no leading clergy person in the United States with the exception of Cardinal Spellman and Billy Graham had endorsed the war in Vietnam. And as the discussion pursued he became convinced that the church in the United States was not a simple tool of American imperialism. Then my German friend moved in and said to him, "Would it be possible to bring in 3,000 copies from West Germany of a biography of Bishop Dibelius?" The Minister turned to the secret police agent who was there monitoring everything and in a brief conversation they both agreed it would be all right. Then he turned and said, "Could we bring in 3,000 copies every month of Die Jungekirche, a church publication of West Germany?" Again, a conversation and again yes.

My friends, the issue of church-state separation is a large issue. It affects Christian missions; it affects the attitude of Communist authorities to governments; it

affects many things overseas, as well as in this country. I cannot conclude without saying that there has never been a decade in the history of the Christian church when there weren't serious church-state problems--persecution of the church by the Roman emperors in the First Decade, then the acceptance by the Christian church of the whole military effort of Constantine. The church from that day to this, in effect, has become a handmaiden of the warmaking state, so that Christians in each country fight their fellow Christians as if it made no difference whatsoever because the nation state has become god during those years. There is a spirit as well as a constitutional problem to this church-state issue. And unless we take that spirit seriously in all of its ramifications, we are not in the final analysis really serving the Lord.

Women in the Eighties

Sarah Weddington

It really is a pleasure for me to be here for a number of reasons. One, because the Christian Life Commission has for so long been a leading voice in looking at all the many facets of human rights, a concern derived from Jesus' own teachings of the sanctity of the individual and our responsibility as caring Christians; second, because I do feel very much at ease with the group, having come from a sister denomination and having been raised in the church; and third, because I am proud to serve a president who is setting a Christian example for the nation. Not only does he come from the Southern Baptist tradition, having served as a trustee for six years of your Brotherhood Commission, but, as I travel, people around the world talk to me about Jimmy Carter, and one of the things they always say is that they are very aware of his religious beliefs, his regular worship participation, and his concern about human rights on a worldwide basis. When I went to the White House, I really did not know the President that well; and, yet, I have found as I have served there that his religious beliefs are also very much a part of his private life.

The first time I had lunch with the President and Mrs. Carter was not a formal occasion; it was simply sharing a simple meal with me, a new staff member. The first thing they said was, "Let us bow." Having grace before meals, being true to his Christian heritage, has been very much a part of President Carter's White House leadership. It is another reason I enjoy working for him.

I am particularly pleased to be here because of your position as leaders in your community. I know that the words you take back, the thoughts and concepts, and your response to them, is a part of a process of changing American society and of changing American thought.

I look forward to the 1980s because I think it will be a very challenging but a rewarding time for women. Some of your other speakers have talked about the fact that we are no longer in the streets, and we're not. But the reason we are not in the streets is, in part, because we are on the inside of places we were marching about before. We now are in the Cabinet; we now are in the

top ranks of government; we now are sitting on Federal benches. Thirty-one of the thirty-five women sitting on Federal benches have been appointed in the last three years.

And, looking ahead, I would say there will be all kinds of things coming in the 1980s. For example, there has never been a woman on the United States Supreme Court. And yet, the President has said that if he had a vacancy, he would consider it an honor to be the first president ever to put a woman on the Supreme Court; I have my list of candidates and he has his list of candidates, and I think that is a very real possibility.

Take another example, a woman running for president or vice president. I have talked to the President about it; he does not think 1980 is the year! But, certainly the polls indicate that the voters of this country have changed to the point where they would be willing to accept a woman as a candidate, even at that level. And I think during the 1980s we could well see a very serious candidate, a woman for either president or vice president.

As I thought about what I would like to leave with you, I thought about my work. There are two themes that we have used for our work for women in the White House. The first one I call mainstreaming. In essence it is one of our long-range goals to make women truly a part of the mainstream of business, religion, government, and every other aspect of our lives in this country. And second, and the point I want to concentrate on today, is that we hope for a world in the 1980s in which women will truly have all choices for their lives: the choice of being wife and mother, of being honored and respected and not penalized for having made that choice; the choice of combining family with paid work or volunteer service outside the home; or the choice of emphasizing the professional.

While I will not speak to it as directly, I realize that as the roles of women change, so do those of men. As women choose the role of wife and mother and as we look for legal protection of their rights in that role, it means that the rights of men will be altered somewhat. As we look at the role of women in combining homemaking and work outside the home, it often means a greater sharing of responsibilities between husband and wife, both in the home and for production of family income. So, while I will not specifically address the point repeatedly, I am conscious that when I talk about changes for the role of women, I am also talking about changes in the role of men.

I want to stress choices as a theme. I hope when you leave here you will remember it. I hope you will examine every choice, every proposal for a policy in the church, every law, with the question, "Does it really make all choices available, or does it favor one over another?"

In the 1970s, I think part of what we did was spend time talking about getting women into the professions; we had to do so at that point in order to open those doors. But what we forgot to do was constantly repeat that the professional route was one of the choices that ought to be available.

Liz Carpenter has said that there is not a single man or woman today whose life and thoughts have not been changed in the last ten years because of the Women's Movement. If you think about your own attitudes and

your own lives, that is probably very much the case.

The past ten years have not brought as much change as the last hundred. For example, if we look back that far, we would remember states with laws that said there were three classes of people who did not have the ability to give consent. They were idiots, imbeciles, and women--in that order. Or for example, laws previously provided that if a woman married, she had to have the consent of her husband in order to convey property, even if it was property that she acquired by gift or inheritance, or that she herself earned. Until 1954, we did not have uniform laws in this country allowing women to serve on juries because of the "terrible kinds of things" women might be exposed to if they served on juries. Certainly our attitudes and our laws have changed a great deal, and we are still a part of that process of change.

In 1975, we had the first of the conferences on the decade of women which the United Nations declared. The first conference was held in Mexico City. The second conference was scheduled this coming summer for Tehran, Iran. It has been moved and we are going to Copenhagen; that reminds me of how delicate those measures of progress can be and how vigilant we must be. The goal we should all strive for, to me, was expressed by Eleanor Roosevelt years ago when she said, (and I paraphrase) "I look forward to a day when men and women, each contributing their own best talents and working in partnership, can make a better world for all."

The fact is that the family has changed. I know that Jim Guy Tucker must have dwelled on that at some length in his remarks to you, but I want to point out one aspect of American family life that I had not considered until I thought about this statistic. If you were to define a typical American family as being a husband who works outside the home, a wife who works inside the home, and two or more minor children residing at home, you have just described sixteen percent of American families.

Very seldom do we have households where the father is the sole earner, or where the mother is not engaged in paid activities outside the home, or where there are children still living at home. And as you think of your own neighborhood or your own PTA or your own classes at the church, you might find that those statistics fit.

I did a survey of my own staff at the White House. I found a fifty-five-year-old man, married to the same woman for thirty-four years, whose children have grown up and are no longer at home; I found a divorced woman who is raising a twelve-year-old son by herself and a woman who has been widowed; I found a twenty-two-year-old single woman whose parents live in New York; I found a young married couple, both employed, who come home every night after work and with great delight read to their two daughters, ten and twenty-one months. I found a woman who divorced, remarried, and lives with her husband, children, and her husband's mother in sort of a modern-day version of the extended family.

Thus at the beginning of the 1980s, if we look at the American family, we will see how much change has already taken place. That change underlies the necessity that choices of various roles be available to women and

that the opportunity exist for women to come in and out of various roles at different points in their lives.

If you think of the role of full-time homemaker, certainly there is much that is often said about the great desirability of the role. One letter I got recently from a woman who saw me on a TV show seems to capitalize that feeling very well. She said, "Dear Ms. Weddington: You mentioned that over fifty percent of women work outside the home. Well, there are a vast majority of women who choose to be homemakers first and foremost.

We feel it is very important to create a loving, relaxed, organized environment in which our family can grow. We feel it is important to guide and teach our own children instead of turning this important responsibility to someone else. We feel it is important to have well-planned and nutritious meals instead of boxed mixes which add preservatives and artificial items.

We are not bored or upset with our lives. Every day offers delightful challenges for our talents. We do not say, 'I don't have the time; get someone else to do the job; I have more important things to do.' What could be more important than caring for your own family?"

And yet, I have seen in my office as a family law practitioner, many of those same women--women have said exactly the same things and feel very genuinely that spirit, and I agree with them--facing problems legally and societally for having made this choice. For example, when I was practicing family law in Texas up until three years ago, if a woman came in to me and said, "I've been married nineteen years; my husband has filed for divorce; what do I do?" The first thing I would tell her was, "Try to stay married twenty years if there is any way you can." The reason I would say that is because the Social Security system was set up so that if a woman had not been married more than twenty years before a divorce, she had no right to receive any payments based on her husband's Social Security benefits. To be eligible for retirement income, she had to begin anew to establish her own Social Security rights by working, or had to be employed in a place where she could get adequate pension benefits. The Carter Administration, changed the law; so that after ten years of marriage a woman is entitled to share in the Social Security benefits of the family, including those established by her husband during that time.

One of the proposals we are looking at, and we are having hearings on it in Washington next week, is whether or not it wouldn't be a fairer system to take all of the Social Security contributions made in a family, by either husband or wife, and in essence split them. Thus, if the husband is the only one earning Social Security, he would take a portion of the benefits and the wife would take a portion of the benefits for the period they're married. Or, if she is working and he is working, they would both contribute to Social Security and both share equally in the benefits. In other words, it would be a sharing of benefits instead of the current system which basically recognizes a working husband's benefits with a homemaker having limited rights to claim against it.

Health care is another problem area. Four years ago, I had a woman come to me who had

been married thirty-two years to a man who was a lawyer with a very prominent international firm. He had filed for divorce. She had discovered shortly before the divorce was filed that she had cancer. Once a divorce was granted, she relinquished her status as his dependent and, therefore, was no longer eligible for health coverage under his employer's policy as a dependent. Because of her history of medical illnesses, she could not get a private carrier to cover her at a time she knew she would have mounting and severe medical problems.

Health care is an important aspect of rights for women who have chosen the role of wife and mother. One of the things we are trying to encourage is provisions through private pension and private health care policies, and possibly through some Federal programs, to convert rights to coverage so that women do not lose all benefits in the event the family is dissolved. This could be applied in the case of death of a spouse, too.

Take pension rights, for example. We find generally that the law says a husband can choose a pension policy that allows him coverage but, in the event of his death, has no benefits for the wife. Other policies allow a lump-sum payment to a husband without his wife realizing that the trade-off for that lump-sum payment is that should he die, she will have no lasting benefits. In fact, according to the best statistics I can find, there are about twenty-six million homemakers in this country who are ineligible not only for Social Security but also for any other kind of pension rights.

We must find ways to make the role of wife and mother truly available in the legal and financial sense, as well as in a personal sense.

I will not long forget something that happens at a Washington party. It is so natural in a place where many women are working outside the home to say to someone, "And what do you do?" and to sense the embarrassment of some women when they say, "I am just a mother; I am just a wife." One of the good things coming out of the changes of the seventies as we move into the eighties is the reaffirmation of the value of the role of wife and mother. We are trying to change those things that have made it a difficult choice. We are looking with compassion on those women who have become displaced homemakers, whether because of death, divorce, desertion, or some other reason. Through CETA, many displaced homemakers are eligible for Federal job assistance, such as counseling, if they must reenter the work force, and are becoming aware of some of the other assets available to them.

Some women are not free to choose the full-time role of homemaker. That brings us to a second category of women: those who combine homemaking with paid or volunteer work outside the home. Statistically if you took a typical block, whether it is in Houston, Atlanta, or any city in between, at six out of every ten houses a woman will leave the home each morning to go to a full-time job.

More women hold jobs today than they ever have before. They work not just because they want to use their talent, but in many cases because they must. Two out of three women in the labor force are there because they are single, divorced, widowed, or married to someone who makes less than \$10,000 a year. They are working because of economic neces-

sity. For them, a paycheck is not just pin money; it's really bread on the table and the rent paid.

The combining of roles of mother and of worker outside the home has given rise to what I have called the "superwoman syndrome." You know this woman. She balances the company's books at ten in the morning, balances the family checkbook at ten at night, packs the lunches, finds the galoshes, changes the filters in the furnace, running through life and airports like O.J. Simpson. So often we find problems and pressures being created because in many ways the work place has not adjusted to allow for a duality of roles. Whether we are talking about part-time jobs, flexi-time jobs, or job sharing, we are looking for ways that men and women both can combine work and home responsibilities.

I was at a recent international conference and I was looking at some of the things other countries have done. Though I am not specifically recommending any of them, I bring them to your attention because it's a worldwide problem. For example, in Sweden, there was a law which said, in essence, that a woman mandatorily gets six months leave with full pay following the birth of a child. They changed the law to say that the leave could be taken either by the mother or the father, because they were finding that women's careers were, to some extent, being harmed by the fact that they were always the one to take leave. Sweden has found that even after the law was changed, only fourteen percent of the people who take leave following the birth of a child are fathers; eighty-six percent are women. So now they are considering a law which would provide that for three months after birth the mother would take off and for the next three months the father would take off. It would be mandatory.

I'm not sure that's the answer for us or for them. But it is an indication of the need to change work environments so that husband and wife can participate in both work life and child rearing. It also presents the need for better day-care arrangements, or what I would call supplemental child care. And I think the word "supplemental" is good because it recognizes the primary child care responsibility is in the home and family. But certainly there is a need to supplement child care because of work outside the home.

One of the accomplishments I was very proud of when I was in the Texas legislature was changing our divorce law so that custody provisions now call for the parent best able to care for the child to have custody. Kramer vs. Kramer is a movie that illustrates the fact that more and more men are seeking custody; many are obtaining custody of their children on the basis that they are the better parent to care for the child.

In our church environments we must more and more be looking to whether or not the programs we provide for the children of working parents are comfortable for the father who is a single, working parent, or even the father who is very much involved in the care of his child. Supplemental care is something churches may want to look at, and certainly an issue in church program development should involve how people better can combine their roles at home and at work.

For many women, volunteer service has been a way to make a contribution outside the home. Things have changed completely from a time in the 1970s when volunteer service was

not looked upon with pride. Many organizations realize how much they rely on volunteer services. So now volunteerism is back in the forefront with Mrs. Carter leading the effort to reestablish its merit.

One of the changes we have made is to provide a place on Federal work forms where job applicants can list experience gained through volunteer service. It is a way of recognizing the kinds of skills that women have long shown in volunteer service. Many cities, counties, and some private employers are now changing also.

The third category of women are those who are emphasizing the professional. In terms of the higher paid jobs, we have far more women today who hold positions with high pay. But in the 1970s to the 1980s we have seen a reduction in the overall wages of women as compared with those of men. Sometimes you will see people wearing little buttons which say, "59¢." It's a symbol of the fact that women, on the average, earn 59¢ for every dollar earned by men who work. Today a college graduate who is a woman can expect to earn on the average less than a high school dropout who is male.

Part of the problem is caused by what we would call occupational segregation. Eighty percent of women who work outside the home continue to work in the traditional, female occupations, such as teaching, nursing, sales, and clerical. Part of the wage gap is the difference in the kinds of jobs held by men and women. If you look at professions that have been predominantly for women, we still see some problems. For example, eighty-four percent of the elementary school teachers are women, but women are only nineteen percent of the elementary school principals. In many instances women go into the more traditional roles partly because of education. We found when colleges tried to open up fields like engineering, science, and math to women, very few women could qualify for the programs because they hadn't taken the preliminary courses in high school that they needed as prerequisites.

I once heard a saying that "Sexism is dangerous, and you can catch it in the public schools." When I was teaching I discovered that if you looked at an eighth grade social studies textbook, about ninety-four out of a hundred illustrations would be of men and the other six of women showed them in the traditional fields. I hope you will begin to look at those textbooks your children bring home more carefully to see whether or not they present each of the kinds of choices that should be available for women.

We also are talking today more about not just equal pay for equal work, but equal pay for work of equal value. We are trying to define what that is. For example, in one state we discovered a librarian receives less pay than a county liquor clerk. In Denver we found that the city and county paid plumbers more than they did nurses. In other states we found similar kinds of things. We are looking at whether or not there has been wage discrimination in determining pay for the traditional jobs.

I was interested to read your "Findings of the Consultation on Women in Church-Related Vocations" from September of 1978. I found it had some very interesting discussions in it, and I couldn't help but think about the need for educational materials within the church to be less sex role biased

and to present more options. I couldn't help but think about the invitation to both men and women to serve in all aspects of life. I can remember growing up, hearing one of my friends talk about her denomination. Her mother had been proposed for a deacon position in the church and was turned down because they had never had a woman deacon; they didn't think women deacons were appropriate, and they weren't ever going to have it in their church. I heard that discussion with such disappointment. That has, luckily, changed. But we are not completely there yet.

The 1980s will be changing times for both men and for women. I hope that the 1980s will bring not only a few new key positions for women but also very real life choices for men and for women. For women, I'd like to see three choices: the choice of being full-time wife and mother; the choice of combining family with paid or volunteer work outside the home; or the choice of emphasizing the professional.

I hope as you are looking at laws in your legislatures, as you are looking at your church policies, as you are thinking about your own attitudes on issues you will keep before you that constant question of whether or not the policy or the proposal being suggested truly makes all these choices available. And then, I hope the 1980s will truly be a time when, as Eleanor Roosevelt said, "We are able to build a world in which men and women acting in partnership can each contribute their own best talents to building a better world for all."

Ever Rethinking The Lord's Prayer

R. Buckminster Fuller

My definition of the word "believe" means to accept an explanation of physical phenomena without any experiential evidence. At the outset of my resolve not only to do my own thinking but to keep that thinking concerned only with directly-experienced evidence, I resolved to abandon completely all that I ever had been taught to believe. Experience had demonstrated to me that most people had an authority-trusting sense that persuaded them to-believingly-accept the dogma and legends of one religious group or another and to join that group's formalized worship of God.

I asked myself whether I had any direct experiences in life which made me have to assume a greater intellect than that of humans to be operative in Universe. I immediately referred back to my good education in the sciences and my directly experienced learning of the operation of a plurality of physical laws, such as those of the inter-attraction of celestial bodies that varied inversely as the second power of the arithmetical distances intervening, which laws could only be expressed in the purely intellectual terms of mathematics, which plurality of laws always and only related to eternal relationships existing between and not in any one of the interrelated phenomena when considered only separately. None of the eternal and always concurrently opera-

tive laws had ever been found to contradict one another, ergo were all designedly inter-accommodative like a train of gears. Many also were inter-augmentative. I said . . . when we use the word "design" in contradistinction to "randomness," we immediately infer an intellect that sorts out a complex of potentials and interarranges components in complementary ways, ergo human mind in discovering a plurality of these only-mathematically-expressible eternal laws, all of which are interaccommodative, is also discovering the intellectually designed scenario Universe whose designing requires the a priori eternal existence of an intellectual integrity of eternally self-regenerative Universe. I said to myself, I am o'erwhelmed by the only-experientially-discovered evidence of an a priori eternal, omni-comprehensive, infinitely and exquisitely concerned, intellectual integrity which we may call God, though, knowing that in whatever way we humans refer to this integrity, it will always be an inadequate expression of its cosmic omniscience and omnipotence.

At the same time as that in which I had resolved to do only my own experientially based thinking, which was in 1927, the Russian Revolution, then ten years old, was beginning to cope with its survival problems by including industrialization as well as farming. This brought into operation in 1928 their five-year plans of successively most important tasks to be accomplished. Realizing from the outset that, in order to organize the complete preoccupation of all their over one-hundred million people with the Communist Party's specific planning, it would be disastrous to their efforts to tolerate the continuing presence of other mystically higher authority than that of the Communist Party, such, for instance, as any of the great organized religions. Probably in pure expediency, the Communist Party said that there is no God, ergo Russia, now committed to omni-scientific technology, was also thenceforth committed to atheism. Many intellectuals around the world accepted this "Party-line" doctrine.

In 1930, Einstein, "Mr. Science" himself, published his "Cosmic Religious Sense--the non-anthropomorphic concept of God." Einstein said that the great scientists such as Kepler and Galileo whom the Roman Catholic Church had ex-communicated as "heretics" were, because of their absolute faith in the orderliness of Universe, far more committed to the non-anthropomorphic cosmic God than were the individuals heading the formal religious organizations.

Since 1927, whenever I am going to sleep, I always concentrate my thinking on what I call "Ever Rethinking the Lord's Prayer." The Lord's Prayer had obviously been evolved by a plurality of deeply earnest and thoughtful individuals whose names we will never know. My latest rethinking of it follows.

I am confident that contrary to the Russian assumption that science invalidated all possibilities of the existence of God that, as specifically argued, my following declaration constitutes a scientifically meticulous, direct-experience-based proof of God.

To be satisfactory to science
all definitions
must be stated
in terms of experience.
I define Universe as
all of humanity's

in-all-known-time
consciously apprehended
and communicated
(to self or others)
experiences.
In using the word, God
I am consciously employing
four clearly differentiated
from one another
experienced engendered thoughts.

Firstly:
those experience-engendered thoughts
which are predicated upon past successions
of unexpected, human discoveries
of mathematically incisive,
physically demonstrable answers
to what theretofore had been misassumed
to be forever unanswerable
cosmic magnitude questions
wherefore I now assume it to be
scientifically manifest,
and therefore experientially reasonable
that
scientifically explainable answers
may and probably will
eventually be given
to all questions
as engendered in all human thoughts
by the sum total
of all human experiences;
wherefore my first meaning for God is:
all the experientially explained
or explainable answers
to all questions
of all time--

Secondly, I mean:
The individual's memory
of many surprising moments
of dawning comprehensions
of an interrelated significance
to be existant
amongst a number
of what had previously seemed to be
entirely uninterrelated experiences
all of which remembered experiences
engender the reasonable assumption
of the possible existence
of a total comprehension
of the integrated significance--
the meaning--
of all experiences.

Thirdly, I mean:
The only intellectually discoverable
a priori, intellectual integrity
indisputably manifest
as the only mathematically storable
family
of generalized principle--
cosmic laws--
thus far discovered and codified
and ever physically redemonstrable
by scientists
to be not only unfailingly operative
but to be in eternal,
omni-interconsiderate,
omni-interaccommodative governance
of the complex
of everyday, naked eye experiences
as well as of the multi-millions-fold
greater range
of only instrumentally explored
infra-and-ultra tunable
micro-and macro-Universe events.

Fourthly, I mean:
All the mystery inherent
in all human experience,
which,
as a lifetime ratioed to eternity,
is individually limited

to almost negligible
t'wixt sleepings, glimpses
of only a few local episodes
of one of the infinite myriads
of concurrently and overlappingly
operative
sumtotally never-ending
cosmic scenario serials.
With these four meanings I now directly
address God.

"Our God--
Since omni-experience is your identity
You have given us
overwhelming manifest:--
of Your complete knowledge
of Your complete concern
of Your complete coordination
of Your complete responsibility
of Your complete capability to cope
in absolute wisdom and effectiveness
with all problems and events
physical and metaphysical
and of Your eternally unfailing
reliability
so to do
Yours, Dear God,
is the only and complete glory.
By Glory I mean
the synergetic totality
of all physical and metaphysical radiation
and of all physical and metaphysical
gravity
of finite
but non-unitarily conceptual
scenario Universe
in whose synergetic totality
the a priori energy potentials
of both radiation and gravity
are initially equal
but whose respective
behavioral patterns are such
that radiation's entropic, redundant,
disintegratings
are always less effective
than gravity's non-redundant
syntropic integrating.
Radiation is plural and differentiable
radiation is focusable, beamable, and
self-sinusing,
is interceptible and separatist,
ergo has shadowed voids and vulnerabili-
ties;
Gravity is unit and undifferentiable
Gravity is comprehensive
inclusively embracing and permeative
is non-focusable and shadowless,
and is omni-integrative;
all of which characteristics of gravity
are also the characteristics of love.
Love is metaphysical gravity.
You, Dear God,
are the totally loving intellect
ever-designing
and ever daring to test
and thereby irrefutably proving
to the uncompromising satisfaction
of your own comprehensive and incisive
knowledge of the absolute truth
that your generalized principles
adequately accommodate any and all
special case developments,
involvements and side effects;
wherefore your absolutely courageous
omni-rigorous and ruthless self-testing
alone can and does absolutely guarantee
total conservation
of the integrity
of eternally regenerative Universe.
Your eternally regenerative Scenario

is the minimum complex
of totally intercomplementary
totally intertransforming
non-simultaneous, differently frequenced
and differently enduring
feed-back closures
of a finite
but non-unitarily conceptual system
in which naught is created
and naught is lost
and all occurs
in optimum efficiency.
Total accountability and total feed-back
constitute the minimum and only
perpetual motion system.
Universe is the one and only
eternally regenerative system.
To accomplish your regenerative integrity
You give Yourself the responsibility
of eternal, absolutely continuous
tirelessly vigilant wisdom.
Wherefore we have absolute faith and
trust in You,
and we worship You
awe-inspiredly,
all-thankfully,
rejoicingly,
lovingly,
Amen."

Summary and Evaluation

W. David Sapp

My task in five minutes is to summarize and evaluate these three days we have spent together. Of course, to squeeze the essence of these thirteen speeches into a five minute concentrate is a task which would baffle even the Minute Maid people. And to evaluate an infant you helped to birth is a not much easier task.

So let me make my summary and evaluation this way. We have not in these days compiled a definitive list of issues for the eighties. And we have not pronounced the last word on the positions we should take on those issues. Rather, we have tried to build a framework for thinking about these concerns and others; and we have tried to establish, in the very gathering of this talented audience, a context in which the issues can be evaluated from a Christian perspective. We have been exposed in these three days to the varied opinions of a wide range of persons who play particularly crucial roles in helping to shape the issues of the eighties. We have thought carefully about precisely what the eighties hold. This has been, we hope, a time of interface between the gospel and the world, and not simply a time of propagandizing the opinions of any individual speaker or participant. The task of devising effective local strategies for coping with these issues we have discussed is yet undone. Here we have begun to think about the future, but the task of prognostication is at best risky. The uncertainties, the ambiguities, the complexities, the mysteries of the unknown eighties have not been erased. Nor will they be even when the eighties have passed.

I have thought a lot during this meeting of a song we sang nearly every other week in the rural Indiana pastorate of my seminary days. "Many things about tomorrow I don't seem to understand, but I know who holds the

future and I know who holds my hand." I didn't like singing that song then. It just wasn't sophisticated. I even tried to help the church outgrow it. A couple of things bothered me, I suppose. To my idealistic side the song seemed a cop-out, a vain attempt to avoid my responsibility for the future and to push it all off onto God. And then, it also seemed too shallow and sentimental. If God holds the future, I reasoned, why have so many horrible futures come to pass? And if God holds my hand, why has it hurt so badly? But that was before two tornadoes I didn't know were coming, before a traumatic move from one city to another, before my father's open heart surgery, before Iran and Afganistan and Kampuchea and a hundred other struggles.

I still think we ought to know all we can about the future and do all we can to make it a future of justice and righteousness under the reign of God. But when I come to the bottom line and can't get a total, when I come to the end of a seminar and can't get a summary, when the vision I seek is just beyond the horizon, when the uncertainties press me, I find myself right back at the Aikman Creek Baptist Church singing it again, "Many things about tomorrow I don't seem to understand, but I know who holds the future and I know who holds my hand." Only this time I don't resent it. I sing it with a restored sense of that most underrated of all religious feelings--hope.

The ultimate question is not "What will the eighties be like?" The ultimate question is how and with whom we shall face the unknown. My own sense of summation, not of what has been said here, but of what has been felt here, is this: As the church of Jesus Christ we will face the eighties with God, and as his children we shall face the eighties with hope.

The Visitation of God

Jimmy Allen

The scripture passage to which I would like for us to turn for this closing time is in Luke 19:41. I have in hand the Phillips Version of that passage. It is the story that tells of Jesus looking over the city of Jerusalem and weeping, and the Bible says, "And as he came still nearer to the city, he caught sight of it and wept over it, saying: 'Ah, if you only knew, even at this eleventh hour, on what your peace depends--but you cannot see it. The time is coming when your enemies will encircle you with ramparts, surrounding you and hemming you in on every side. And they will hurl you and all your children to the ground--yes, they will not leave you one stone standing upon another--all because you did not know when God was visiting you!'"

Every issue with which we have been confronted is a critical issue. It made this program schedule because it was selected as a critical issue. There have been many others that we haven't been able to deal with, but we referred to as we moved through this time together. Critical issues of the eighties--starving people, an overwhelming moral issue on God's agenda for God's children is human survival. If we do not deal with it, we will not have the power of God

with which to deal with anything else and the Spirit of God presses us with that kind of issue. A world running out of energy-- an issue all of us feel, not only in our life styles and in our pocketbooks, in the anxieties of the periphery of our vision; the painful squeeze of inflation among the poor eating away at their ability to deal with the pressures of life, squeezing them in very cruel and vicious kinds of ways; the fragmentation of family and the attempt to discredit the whole concept of commitment in marriage and family; the persistent and pernicious problem of racism with its constant threat of violence and hostility and its subterranean presence ready to erupt into volcanic power at any moment; the threat of nuclear holocaust; the growing threat of becoming increasingly divided in church-state matters with the effort of religiously fervent groups to discredit, divide, and dominate the state and the society by simple, simplistic, emotional issues in which the only one who knows the answer is the one who is making the speech; the potential frankensteinian age of technology in which our technical ability moves from servant to master and we find ourselves threatened in the process. All of these are urgent, ethical issues, but if ethics is defined in its basic etymology as "oughtness," then the urgent oughtness issue with which you and I are confronted is not any of these, though it includes all of them. The urgent oughtness issue is whether or not we will be able to understand when God is visiting us.

The thing that stirred Jesus to tears as he moved to catch sight of the city and see it with its towered temple--speaking about the hope that God would reveal himself one of these days in human form and life style; enough for men to understand and respond to him; knowing that he had come as that revelation--the thing that moved him was not simply the squalor of the poor, nor the injustice of the system of the forgetting and the rejection of the whole concept of human rights by the Roman Empire, not even the breakdown of integrity on the part of the Sadducees who had long since made their peace with their culture and with the power systems of their day. The thing that moved Jesus to weep was that they missed the moment when God was moving. They missed the time of the visitation. They didn't understand the dynamics of God enough to respond to him in the midst of that situation and that challenge. And so he stands there and looks at them and only twice in the New Testament does the Bible record Jesus crying. One of them was when he saw a family fragmented and grieved by death at the grave of Lazarus, and the other one was when he saw the deadness of a people who named his name and didn't understand his presence, who talked about him, but did not meet him, ignored him, indeed, crucified him. It is in that time that God cries--that God weeps.

Is there a moment of God's visitation? If there is a moment, are we going to be able to deal with it? Are we going to be able to understand it? Will we respond to the Spirit of God in such a way that we will be able to deal with the issues in the light of his visitation? Are we going to be God's children, moving in concert with the Father's will in dealing with the issues that we face? Or, are we simply floundering our way through the maze of unsolvable problems, trying to

find some way to cope for a while while things keep on in the same kind of order?

When Jesus sees them unwilling to respond, missing the moment of God for them, he cries, and as he weeps, he says, "The reason I am weeping is because you are missing the moment of God, missing the purpose of God, refusing to be the people of God, refusing to be the instrument of God; because you are doing all of this while you are performing religious tasks, saying religious words, and God himself is in your midst, you will know nothing except disarray and disorder." And if you look at the root reason for disarray and disorder in our society, in our families, in our churches, in our communities, in our lives, you will find the root reason is that humanity has missed the visitation of God; that we as individuals missed the movings of God's visitation; and that we live in a grotesque kind of world that's in that kind of disarray because we missed God's visitation to our lives. There is disarray without because there is disorder within.

Oh, it would be marvelous if all of the folks who came into the world could be made better simply by having better information. That would be marvelous. It would be marvelous if all of the folks who came could be made better just because we tooled up the systems a little more. That would be marvelous. But we live in a world under a crushing curse of compiled results of evil and sin, twisting the foundations of our world, twisting the root systems of our society; twisted within us are the very mixed motives and inabilities and weaknesses and strengths that are part of who we are, responding to a society in which the complexities paralyze us and the simplicities escape us in the midst of this kind of world. There is disarray and disorder, and we who belong to Jesus Christ are the folks who ought to be understanding the "oughtness" of understanding God's moment among us.

I want us to see that the unique claim of the Christian experience is that there has been a visitation from God, that the urgent challenge of the Christian insight is that there is now a visitation from God, and the ultimate confidence of the Christian faith is that there will be a visitation from God. We are not like a lot of other folks who are clamoring around trying to find ways to meditate ourselves through to some mystical experience within a very ill defined god force. We are not like a lot of other folks who are climbing the top of intellectual ladders trying to rationally deal with the irrational experience of man. We are not like a lot of other folks who think that in the absence of the presence of the God who claims them, they can become God themselves.

We, who belong to the family, the Way, are a people who make a claim that the Christian experience witnesses to the fact that there has been a visitation from God; that God's moment to reveal himself came and has come to humanity adequately in his Son, Jesus Christ. That as God chose to step over the communication barrier that had been created between himself and his creation, as he reaches down to seek and to save that which is lost, the way he has done that is to make himself understandable in human life-form and human style, in human language so that we know the kind of God he is. We know the kinds of things he wants to do. We know the kinds of ways in which to respond to him be-

cause he has made that available to us in the visitation as Jesus came as a baby, a non-threatening entry for an almighty and cosmic creator.

As he came as a baby and walked among us and identified with us and revealed to us the Father, we have in him and in his record of his Word, we have the visitation; and that visitation changes our whole perspective of what the scheme of life is all about. It puts cause and effect in perspective so that there is purpose and meaning and design for life. As difficult as it is for us to grasp in the midst of any particular situation, any set of circumstances, there is burning in us a feeling, a sense, a conviction, an absolute decision to believe that there is design and purpose, and God has shown that--the key to it in the visitation of his Son, Jesus Christ.

And so in that moving of God in history, you can actually deal with it in the dynamics of the struggles of history, there is a visitation of God, a visitation that is not in and by itself, because God was visiting in many kinds of ways, revealing himself in many kinds of ways. John says this is the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. A visitation not by itself, but a visitation unique in that it is adequate for an understanding of God, in which we can respond to him and allow him to deal with us within our lives and to create in us the openness to define energy as he moves through our lives, to put us in tune with his purpose, with his power, and with his plan.

So the unique claim that draws us together and makes this different from just another seminar on the future is that we really believe, those of us who belong here, we have chosen to believe in the midst of all other kinds of competing ideologies. We have chosen to believe. We staked our lives on the visitation of God and on that visitation adequately giving us the message about him. The urgent challenge of that Christian insight is that there is now a visitation; that this is God's moment for involvement; that God is at work in intense and real ways now, seeking to bring about his will in his people, in his world.

Now there are a lot of us who have difficulty agreeing that there is a fresh moving of God among us. Some of us have difficulty because we have looked with such idealism and expectancy that that's been turned to cynicism while we watch people manipulating people in the name of religion, and we have decided that God is not doing much differently from what we read about him and the people claiming to be his in other ages and other times.

And, therefore, there are a number of us in this room who fight the daily battle with cynicism. A cynic is always an idealist who is frustrated and disappointed in trying to get hold of things and becomes angry about it. It's a cynicism which may be healthy or destructive, but many of us are fighting that battle constantly, and we are saying, "Where is the sign of his coming?" It has not changed since the earliest day. "Where is the sign of his coming?"

And yet, there grows in my own spirit, and there is in my experience, an affirmation, a kind of an obsessive awareness of the fact that this is an intense time of God's activity among his people, that he is

at work in very powerful ways and it comes out in various dynamics, in various ways, and that he is at work in ways far bigger than we have imagined; because we really sort of made God a Southern Baptist tribal diety; and we find ourselves unable to understand how God is really at work in his world. And in the process of that, there are some of us who have great difficulty understanding it, but some of us are tuned in to a kind of a beat, a kind of a rhythm, a kind of an awareness that this is a moment in which God is at work and that that moment won't be forever; and that God has tremendous potential available to his people and he's going to give it to somebody, he's going to pick up somebody, to use them in a time of incipient spiritual awakening, a time when the rumbling of the power of God must burst out, a time when those of us who are in the family ought to be identifying the places where the Father is at work and getting there as quickly as possible, allowing him to work in us and through us.

And that evidence of that moving, that visitation, is seen, as I see it, in the hunger that you find all over this world, a kind of hunger for the eternal, a reaching out for God, an urgent kind of awareness of vacuum and emptiness. It's not only found in the jaded value systems of a materialistic Western society. It's found in the kind of throbbing, urgency of the militant revivals of faith around this world, as people are hungry. They are hungry because the Spirit of God has made us for something better and something different, and there is about us a reaching out and a reaching up, a yearning. We're filling that hunger with all kinds of junk food. We're reaching out in a kind of, what Harvey Cox calls The New Gluttony, the gluttony for experience. Every one of us has had the latest experience, but the fact is that all of that is a testimony to the fact that there is a visitation, that the Spirit of God is moving in convicting people of emptiness and sin, of need--a visitation from God.

I am deeply helped by Moshe Kahana, my rabbi friend, who helped me understand what the word chatah means in the description of sin in Hebrew, as he talks in terms of it not just missing the target. I have always seen the hamartia of missing the target meaning of sin, but it also means missing the point.

There is a tragic fact of sin in this world that we, all of us, have sin, we have missed the point and fallen short of the glory of God. We missed the point of God's visitation, God's purpose, God's plan. We missed the point, but there is something in us, an inner yearning, an inner hunger that says, "Oh God, I want to know that purpose, I want to be and to belong; I want to be a person whom you use to make things happen. I yearn for that." And so, there is a visitation. And that stirring of the Spirit of God is found in the hunger of people--hunger of people, not simply in the stained glass atmospheres in which we call folks religious--a hunger that is worldwide and deep and urgent; a hunger that God is creating. We will be in disorder and disarray if we miss the moment of God's visitation in creating the hunger.

I see the moving of God in the fact that there is a moving revealed in the intensity of the confrontation with evil in our world.

And the Bible says where sin abounds, grace also abounds, and for a long time I sort of thanked God for that in very individualistic terms. If I sin a lot, I'm going to get some grace for it all. Then I began reading the acts of God in the visitation of his church and discovered that in the very places where he was toughest, that was where God's power was able to be revealed in the greater way. Then I began to realize that wherever there is pressure, there is counterpressure; wherever there is forward movement, there is not simply inertia, there is resistance. And then I began to realize that wherever the Spirit of God is really at work creating the agendas for his people, and they begin to move, there is an intensity of opposition, an intensity of conflict. And I began to see that where sin abounds, that's where grace is abounding--maybe where grace has already been abounding--and that that interaction is a very sign of the awakening of God. You read through Christian history and find those breaking outs of God--and find out how intense the confrontations with evil become when God's people understand the visitation and respond to it. There is an evidence of it in the rising tide of God's provision of a new dimension of resources among his people.

You know we Baptist folk have wanted to be a movement, and I wish we could stay that way. We became a denomination, and we're on our way to becoming a church with a capital "C," and all of that is what I would like to reverse in the historical process. I like to see us when we're at our best. And we're really at our best when the Spirit of God is moving among his people and calling out their gifts and lifting up the folks, and they're finding their gifts challenged and their resources invested, and they're out there at the task of being salt and light. That's when we're really at our best.

There is a stirring that I discern as I move among the laity of our fellowships that encourages me about the moving of the visitation. I want you to know God is stirring visions in the hearts of young people and of men and women. God is stirring visions that we who have been trained to understand moderation in our theological position on what is doable are going to have to be surprised by. Because these folks who don't know it's not doable often find God can do it. We are seeing a moving as God has put it together, the resources of human lives that are stirred and ready and urgently going to find some way to invest it. That energy is going somewhere. It won't stay capped off and if we can't find ways and means within the structures of our fellowship to provide for those channels of mission, energy and urgency, then it's going to go someplace else, for our God is visiting us. We who ought to be in on that, I'm afraid, are hearing the sobbings of Christ as he sees us moving about our business as usual, making sure the rules and rituals are followed, making sure that everybody says its the same, while Jesus looks at us and cries.

There is a sign of his visitation in the foment of those religious feelings and response to God. Then there is a sign of his visitation in the confrontation with the whole conscience factor as we are moving in to our society. You know, I have had mixed emotions about all of the efforts to turn right-wing conservative religious theology

into right-wing electoral votes. I have moved among the folks now called Baptists for about twenty years, urging everybody to get involved, but I said when I want to get involved, I want to get involved with my understanding of values. And now they're all marching down to get involved and take charge of things, and I'm getting nervous about that.

But, the fact is, that in a very real way, the stirrings of conscience as simplistic, as uninformed, as emotionally out of touch with what really is the need, as much as that is true, it is a sign of the stirring of something. Not simply anxiety over the way our tax money is going--there are some of the folks in there--but in the hearts of a lot of good folks, the Spirit of God is stirring a conscience about things. And while they may interpret that conscience right now, only about pornography and gambling, because that's all anybody has told them about--that same conscience is the conscience that's being raised on human rights, on what's been happening in a society in which we talk about the game of righteousness and justice; and justified by our neglect and our self-interest, policies of supporting governments that decimate their people. There is in the basic conscience level of the people of God a part of the moving of God, a coming to grips, a willingness, a seed bed for us if we've got the courage to do it, to call the people to come to grips with what is right in the eyes of God and not simply what is expedient in the power confrontations of our day.

Most of you know that some of us, Charles Kimball and John Walsh and I, went to Iran, dealing with trying to find the facts and trying to discover the rhythms of what the power centers were and what the situation was and is. It's a complex thing, and I can't get into it deeply enough to open the subject with you at this time because there's just not time. But, a bottom line out of that is that we are living with the neglect of our own principles over a period of several administrations, not only there, but in places all over the world and one of the folks who came back with us said it well. He said, "I went to Iran to find out who was in charge of things and I came back wondering who's in charge of things here." Who let the policies be made that are so far out of touch with my value systems about human life, the sanctity of individuals? Who made those policies? I wrestled with that in the midnight, thinking about it, haunted by it, and some of the experiences we have had, and you know what I had to come to bottom line? I couldn't find the scapegoats, because the folks who made those policies made them in a vacuum of my participation and of your participation. We sat back thinking we couldn't be expert enough to know, while folks who claim to be, did the kinds of things that got us in the kind of trouble we're in, because we simply didn't sense the motions of God's visitation, making us aware of our responsibility to courageously call our own systems under the callings of Christian conscience.

As I move among folks angry as we are about that illegal deed and about the plight of those that we care about inside that Embassy, there is under that anger a sensitivity that says we don't want anymore to be involved in any kind of thing that allows us to

forward a regime that systematically cripples its people. There's something about the moving of God about that--raising our conscience level, and we need to recognize that as a part of the visitation of God among us.

You would expect me to say that the visitation of God, in my judgment, has a great deal to do with the throbbing, urgency of a missionary impulse that God has put deep in the heart of his people. I have the feeling that time is running out--that the urgency of God's visitation, at least for us as our fellowship of Christians--it's not going to be very long before God is going to find somebody else if we don't respond to it. I would say that the very fact that that is on our agenda, that we're talking, working, seeking to be the people who will confront the world with the gospel in every means possible, is a part of the visitation.

God's moment of vindication and victory, the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ--is that a little too Arkansas and East Texas for some of you folks? Is it a little scary to you? I remember walking through the streets of Tehran and saying, "I wonder if Hal Lindsay is really right?" It was a shocking thing in my spirit. The fact is, I don't think that kind of theology is what I can build my understanding of God on in his Word, but I can tell you this. He's coming again. He's coming again. He's not going to let this whole world, his whole creation slipping from his grasp continue this way. He's coming again. Whether that's going to be now or later, I'm going to leave up to him. He said he's in charge of that, but I'm going to seek to understand that that visitation is what makes today's present tense visitation make sense. There's no sense in my simply trying to do good and turn power things around and do all those other things unless there is some way down the way in which we are taking territory and claiming that for God in tune with what he's going to bring about. And the Word of God is clear about the fact that Jesus is coming again. It's clear about the fact that because he's coming again and this earth is going to be melting with the fervent heat that the key question is, "What manner of men ought we to be?" And that's the place I want to put my foot down and say that since he's coming again, and there is a visitation that I'm looking forward to, and since that hope fills my spirit that one day he will come and all of this will be set in order, I want to be the kind of man who is in on God's future today. I want to claim every bit of the territory for the reign of God I can, that it will already look like what it's going to ultimately be like because God is using me as salt and light at this moment. The visitation of the future is what gives urgency and hope and power to being sensitive to the visitation of the present. And the visitation of the past is what gives some sense of understanding about the visitation of the present.

Therefore, in the light of what God has done and in the light of what God is going to do, what are we supposed to do? What we're supposed to do is to be the people of God dealing with the ethical issues of our own lives and families and churches and communities and nation states and world.

Some of you have seen The Elephant Man play that's sort of the rage of the current Broadway productions. It shows, as you

know, a grotesque figure, very uniquely acted out on the stage, of a man who was a freak of nature in the 1800s. The picture suggests his grotesqueness in the man's awkward way of moving and continues to build that image in your mind, a man of a massive head and a twisted body and one good arm and a grotesque face and a stench; and all of those things that caused him to be a freak in a sideshow until a compassionate, humanist doctor took him in and began to work with him and clean him up and try to help him.

Gradually there is a dialogue between the doctor and the man and the bishop and the man and others and this man. We discover that under all that, underneath all that twistedness and grotesqueness, there is a sensitive human spirit; one who has faith that he is not always going to be twisted and grotesque, that there has shown himself in Jesus Christ the God who can fashion it differently someday.

And the process of it, the underlying theme--several of them go into the play--showing with his one good hand continuing building a church, just working on it, building a church. Everybody who comes to see him, finds in the prism of his character, personality, some reflection of themselves and something that rebukes them or something that encourages them; and so he becomes the rage of London, of the day. It becomes the in thing to do to come to see him, this grotesque, but strangely beautiful man. And you see him constantly building a church, building a church.

The end scene, his death scene, comes. In this time comes the other side of his yearning, the yearning to be like everybody else, to be accepted by everybody else, to experience the experiences of everybody else--that side he reaches out for all through the play. One of the things that he cannot do is that he cannot sleep lying down because of the shape of his skull and his body and his esophagus, but, finally, he lies down to sleep. The yearning to be like every other human being, so strong and irresistible, and he is asphyxiated. He dies.

I sat enthralled by the struggle, for I found the person of that man and the play reflecting a lot of who I am, twisted by sin, grotesque in ways I dread to face, something inside me reaching out with a faith that God is and that he is at work, that he has visited, that he will visit, that he is now visiting, wanting in my spirit not to miss that. But something else inside, making me want to be like the other folks, in on what is happening, doing all those things. And all the time, with what's left of me, helping to build a church. And I found myself yearning for the play to end differently, wanting the man not to sacrifice his life to be like men, but to lift his life to be like him. I found myself wanting to lay before me and you this day the question, grotesque as we are, we've been visited by God. The movings of God are real in our lives. The aspiration for the Spirit is very real. Let's don't sell out to be like those folks. Let's be salt and light. Let's be engaged and involved. Let's keep on building his church, or we miss God's moment, and the sobs of our disarray and disorder are simply reflections of the sobs of God over the fact that we didn't understand the things that made for our peace.



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

6/80/2M

Foy Valentine, Executive Director