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Confusion in Academia

CHARLES E. GAUSS

I formerly stated that our western culture is really a combination of two incompatible patterns of thought, one curious, open-minded, and grounding knowledge on public evidence; the other receptive, dogmatic, elaborating a body of belief given by authority to be accepted by faith. I called the first the Greek cultural pattern, since the Greek world was its paradigm; the second I called the Hebraic-Christian tradition. It has been the strength (as well as the weakness) in our culture that it has struggled to try to reconcile these two incompatible ways of thinking, and that both habits of thinking remain with us today.

This dualistic split is reflected in the two functions that education must perform for us. Its first task is to transmit the cultural patterns and traditions of our civilization. This involves the preservation of a body of thought and belief with some attempt to reinterpret it for its relevance for the present. This is most often done by some form of indoctrination. Only occasionally do we try to make this part of the educational process an adventure in rediscovery. This function may easily tend to develop a receptive and quietistic mind, corresponding to the Hebraic-Christian pattern of thinking as I stated it. The other task of education is to stir up mental ferment, to anticipate change, and to prepare one to meet new problems with new solutions. This more readily encourages an open and inquiring mind, and corresponds to the Greek cultural pattern.

Charles E. Gauss is Assistant to the Provost at Nova University. This is the material of the second keynote address to the Florida Association of School Psychologists at the Meeting of the Florida Psychological Association in Daytona Beach, Florida, on May 6, 1966.
I believe all the "confusion" we meet in education in our present-day world comes from these two functions and from the good and evil in their employment. I want to assess this confusion in academia.

Though I do not belong to the school of ordinary language analysis in philosophy I am going to attempt to distinguish the meanings of and to analyze in everyday language the different kinds of confusion. I find they are four in number. And I believe that good can be said for each of them.

When we think of confusion in the academic community today we immediately think of student unrest and revolt. The older generation frequently shakes its head in condemnation of such goings-on, forgetting its own youth. The phenomenon is natural. It comes from the overemphasis that educational institutions put upon the first of the two functions I mentioned. The transmission of tradition leads to the apparent erection of an "Establishment", and the consequent expectation that the values of the Establishment are sacrosanct. At least that is what it seems to youth. Consequently their revolt is one manifestation of their general disaffiliation from the ways of their fathers, a resentment against routine and its deadening effect.

They feel that the Establishment expects them to take their place within it and play out a role within its structure. This seems futile to them, for they feel playing a role does not allow one to develop his own self. Is this resentment not justified? I suppose, for instance, that in the United States there must be at least several hundred people who make their living by manufacturing and selling pizza mix. Just think, they spend their days seeing how they can improve their product and how they can better market it! They give the most and best of their waking hours to these efforts. They build up a flourishing business and make money at it, and the business becomes their life interest. Then, probably at sixty-five, they retire and what happens? Their role relinquished, their one interest is gone. Soon the bridge playing, the fishing, the lying on the beach...
and the shuffle board in Florida become boring. Then they find themselves with no personal resources to fall back upon, since they never developed their own selves. All they did was to play the silly role of pizza-mix purveyor. The case is little different even if one is president of General Motors. The young person needs desperately to make himself a distinctive person, and not get lost in the crowd, or take the compromise of a role.

The student revolt is also against pedantry. It is so easy for a teacher engaged in transmitting a cultural heritage to become uninspiring. One must be a rare teacher to make tradition come alive with relevance for the present. I suppose somewhere in one of our large universities, such as the University of California, there is probably a class in the early poetry of Edmund Spenser. And I suppose the class has a fair number of students. Think how difficult it is to make such material exciting and meaningful. You know, young people have a healthy way of sensing genuineness. They know, who are the good teachers, who are pedantic, which are the good courses, which the duds. I don't know how they do it, but they can always smell out what is worthwhile. (That is why no good teacher need fear student appraisals of faculty.) The sad thing is that nothing that is good is other than rare, and very often the student finds that much of what he is being exposed to seems only to reinforce his disillusionment with accepted ways, and to have no relevance to the demands of life. Confronted by this, he looks to simple patterns of the non-Establishment. He explores uncritically cabaret-, not genuine, Existentialism, which says that life is futile but make yourself. He takes up pseudo-Zen, or the philosophy of Ayn Rand, or causes of the extreme left or right. This is a perfectly natural reaction for youth, and these are not dangerous symptoms of inherent radicalism. In time their feelings and opinions will level off. These intellectual revolts are good even though not definitely directed. They put some yeast in the dough of conformity; they induce questioning instead of complacency. It is a gross injustice to label these restless youths irresponsible beatniks.
Confusion occurs in academia, in the second place, where certain problems in education arise to which there is no clear solution as yet. One of these is in respect to technical education, particularly in engineering. It is literally true that someone who has been trained as an engineer must relearn the new techniques of his profession within ten years of the time he has finished his schooling, for by then those techniques will have changed so radically that what he has learned is no longer useful. He must continue to do this periodically during his life. The change in technical knowledge is too rapid for a school any longer to be able to train a man in the particular skills which he will use. More than this, the changes that come with automation are bringing about the obsolescence of some established skills and the creation of new ones. Having been fitted with a specific skill a man suddenly finds that skill is no longer needed. His livelihood demands that he learn new skills and turn to a new kind of job, often to one that has never existed previously. Technical education as specific job training is obsolete; it must become something completely different. It must educate the individual to be adaptable to change and to learn to do things he doesn’t now dream he will ever have to do. In short, modern technical education must be creative. The problem is how to make it so.

I do not claim to have the answer, but I do have two suggestions. First I would suggest that more of the process of education be made an apprenticeship in research. Working with a research man as he deals with one of his own projects, a student is initiated into a process which involves the analysis of a problem, the elaboration of possible ways of solution, the working out of empirical tests, and the running of subsequent experiments. He learns to use the method and to appreciate its flexibility as he varies it with different problems and different materials. The method becomes more important than the content in any particular problem. Education is a process of discovery, then, more than an inculcation of a rigid technique or a set of solutions.
Second, all education, especially technical, must take on the breadth of acquaintanceship with many and varied fields, humanistic as well as scientific. This is not merely to train "the whole man" or to contribute toward one's values and personal development, or merely to give the edification of a smattering of ignorance about many things. This is because of the fruitful suggestiveness one field may have for another field. Very often an important technological breakthrough is the result of someone's seeing a problem in the light of a model coming from his acquaintance with an area apparently foreign to the one of the problem. The isomorphism of logic, switching circuits, and computers is a clear example. Or the suggestiveness of considering a sociological complex as a kind of biological organism. We seem to increase our grasp on things by approaching them through conceptual models to organize and suggest how we might understand them. I was interested once, during a discussion on models and theories, when one person rose to object to the notion of models as pictures. Models, he suggested, are more like maps. I would use an even more tenuous comparison. To me they are like trails blazed through a forest. They may not always mark the straightest path or follow the natural terrain but they serve to lead one through the maze of trees. Other trails may also serve as well; no one is the only proper one; some are simply more efficient, that is, more graphic, than others. For a model is at base metaphorical. Of course, many complex, modern conceptual models seem to outstrip one's imaginative visualization and to be very attenuated and abstract, but there is always some basis in imaginative transfer.

These are the only two suggestions I have for such educational problems as those that arise with technical education. They do not remove the insolubility of these problems; they, like any other possible ways, only counter the problems somewhat.

My third meaning of confusion I base on the etymology of the word. To confuse, originally in Latin "confundere," had the connotation of pouring together, mixing. The seventeenth-cen-
tury continental rationalists used the word with this meaning when they talked of clear and confused ideas as distinguished from clear and distinct ideas. They meant an idea might be psychologically clear to us, but still be confused in the sense that it is incapable of analysis into its constituent parts. (This extended use of the word “idea” is the source of our talking of the musical ideas of a composer or the ideas of a painter.) But I am beginning to digress too far. Let me come back to my original subject. I want to say that we need a certain confusion in academia, the confusion of mixing, of fusing together, the disparate functions which pursued independently, bring troubles into that community.

Universities today do not know whether they are research institutes, doing work for the government and industry, or whether they are educational institutions. All too frequently professors are so busy with their contracts and consulting work that it is virtually impossible to find them on their own campuses. They are not available to students, even to their own graduate research students, except on rare occasions. The teaching part of their duties is left to assistants. Good teaching demands the stimulation that comes to a faculty member from his research; and schools that expect their faculty members to be teachers only, soon develop the dry rot of mediocrity. On the other hand, when universities become intrigued by the siren call of research with its promise of prestige for the institution to the extent that their professorial staff neglects its educative duties, then serious trouble develops (as well it should) in their relations with their students. The demands of research and education must be fused together. As I suggested just a few minutes ago, this can be done by extending the educational process into one of research apprenticeship as much as possible. If education begins as a process in which the individual rediscovers for himself the knowledge of the past, then he has developed a technique whereby he can continue with fresh and new discoveries. Creative research is higher
education, and education is inquiry and discovery. The two function more compatibly if treated as one.

We talk of the warfare of the two cultures, the sciences and the humanistic arts, as though they were always in direct opposition. Thinking of them in this way, we try to solve the split between them by striving for some “proper balance” between them in the educational process. So we come up with formulae for the tenuous see-saw balance of opposing forces. We try to solve the problem incorrectly because we approach it wrongly. The sciences and the humanities do not represent two opposing cultures. There are similarities between them; they are even identical in some respects. We must emphasize these aspects rather than drive a wedge between them by stressing their obvious differences. Scientific work demands the same creativity as the work of the artist. Humanistic research employs the techniques of any scientific research. Scientific problems and investigation require keen aesthetic awareness. Art demands intelligence. Science and art both issue in an increased understanding of man and his world. We don’t have to deny that science is not art or art not science to stress the similarities between them. It may seem strange to hear a philosopher, whose traditional business has been to mark off meanings and make clear distinctions, advocate de-emphasizing differences in favor of resemblances; but it is possible to make some interesting constructions by fusing together various different metals.

Finally I come to my last meaning of confusion. Good teaching, I have always believed, is a process of throwing the student into “confusion,” stirring up in his mind the turbulence induced by strange questions, disquieting beliefs, odd manners of solutions of problems, and thought patterns foreign to his native ways. For if education is of any purpose to a person, it exists to free him of parochialism of beliefs and habitual ways of thinking.

If you will excuse me for using some of my own teaching experiments as examples, let me mention a few. Several years
ago I decided to give a college course in the philosophy of literature. Originally I intended to do merely the usual thing, to discuss a Greek tragedy for its exploration of a moral problem, to look at world views in Dante, or Thomas Mann, to range through some better-known contemporary novels for their presentation of social problems. Then I thought, “Why do those things? They have been done before. The student has probably already discussed them in literature and other philosophy classes. Why not look for materials that show new responses, that gather up some of the contemporary trends of modern thought and try, whether successfully or not, to deal with them creatively?” So I went to avant-garde literature, to the drama of the absurd, to the anti-novel in France, to some of the international literature of today that is not so widely known and read because its voice is not that of the crowd. Very often it was a struggle for one of my generation to understand and interpret these works, but I felt the labor was amply rewarded. The whole class enjoyed the new adventure and was stimulated to a new critique.

Again, two years ago I had the privilege of being given several small but specially selected groups of students at the Nova High School with whom I could engage in free brainstorming sessions. At one of these we read Samuel Beckett’s *Mime Play I* and then took off in discussion of it. I was amazed at how much perceptiveness there was on the part of the students. As we proceeded we penetrated to an analysis in good depth, and stimulating observations were struck off that had long-term effects in later discussions and also apparently in other classes. Here was material that preserved the openness of the young mind and did not tend to lead it into some set paths where spontaneity and imagination get lost.

With another group I attempted something else. We tried developing a language of touch, imagining we had no other sensory receptors than touch and no other means of communication or basis of concept formation except touch. The object was not so much to develop this language as to see what the
structure of that language would be like and how that might throw some light on our own language and the function language plays in the knowing process. I must admit the experiment was not wholly a success. We were not able to carry it very far for several reasons. In one respect, the students were too sophisticated. They were unable to forget sufficiently the linguistic structures they were acquainted with. They were unable to switch in imagination to a world with which touch would be the only contact; they would “forget” and bring in things touch alone would never give. In another respect they were too naive to be able to analyze what they were doing. And, furthermore, I, too, did not have the ability to push the experiment beyond its beginnings. But we did uncover some interesting things. We found that the distinctions between first, second, and third persons did not hold in such a language. There was only the distinction between me, touching, and thing touched. We might have made further distinction in persons had we developed more what we were doing, I don’t know. Yet, here we did come to a surprising conclusion, that the “natural” distinctions between persons in grammar are not so much distinctions in the relations of things to knower reflected in grammar as the results of the knower’s capacities. Also we found that any distinction between the future indicative and the subjunctive “may” was impossible in our language. To say you will touch or touch again was only to say you may touch and the verb has no object. All these were only the most elementary discoveries, of course. But they suggested to me that such a way as this might be a fruitful way to explore problems of knowing and communicating.

Such, then, are the four meanings of confusion I distinguish. All of them, I feel, are good, not bad. All of them are to be encouraged for their potential in leading to the open mind. Academia must never be allowed to become complacent.
The New River Mystery

AUGUST BURGHARD

THE ORDINARY MAN, who loved nature, asked the Poet:

"When is the best time to plant a tree?"

"Thirty years ago," was the reply.

"Obviously, that is one deadline I won't make," mourned the Ordinary Man. "Tell me, sir, when is the second best time to plant a tree?"

"Today," replied the poet.

And today is the best possible time for all of us, you and me, to take a searching look at mysterious, beautiful New River (and perhaps Miami River and Arch Creek, too) and to consider the question: "Should anything be done about it—and them."

The oldest bit of Seminole humor about New River has to do with an Indian who claimed to speak English, who was engaged in conversation by one of the early white settlers.

"Where," he was asked, "is that river that is supposed to have appeared overnight?"

The Indian turned and pointed: "Him-ar-Shee," he said dramatically.

"Himmarshee" is Indian for "New Water."

White settlers changed it to "New River."

The legend of the overnight appearance of the River came from an Indian race which preceded the Seminoles. And that brings up the first of many of the mysteries and questions about this strange stream: Just how did it originate? When was New River named? By whom? And why was it called "New?"

August Burghard is Executive Secretary of Gold Key of Nova University. The material in this article is taken from a paper delivered to the Historical Association of Southern Florida in Miami and to the Pioneers' Club and the Downtown Kiwanis Club of Fort Lauderdale.
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To get into proper focus how New River came into being we must go back to the great Ice Ages and take a look at a period known as the Pleistocene era. At that time a major change took place in the earth’s climate. The world grew colder. The ice caps at the north and south poles grew larger. Great systems of continental glaciers developed, up to 10,000 feet thick. All of this ice represented enough water, if released, to raise the sea levels 150 feet. The Ice Age change influenced the entire world, including sub-tropical areas such as this. With less water in the ocean, more land was exposed. Florida then was much higher.

About 5,000 B.C. during a warm period, the sea rose to five (perhaps eight) feet above its present level, and remained at that stage for 2,000 or 3,000 years, long enough to complete the carving of the wave-planed Silver Bluff Terrace, and to choke with sand the discharge channels through the Coastal Ridge as far south as Miami.

All during this time the present floor of the Everglades was a shoals area, situated between the low-lying Big Cypress Devils Garden areas on the west and the Coastal Ridge on the east. The Ridge stood out as a low series of islands and disconnected bars. Lake Okeechobee was an extension and slightly deeper part of this great shoal. Then, about 3,000 years ago the excessively warm weather waned. The sea fell to its present approximate level and has been there ever since.

In the great shoal area of the Everglades fresh water replaced the salt and brackish waters. In deeper parts of the area, where the land was always submerged, plant remains accumulated until finally, the peat and muck deposits of today developed. Gradually, these materials collected over a greater and greater area. And as the vast basin became almost filled, the water level rose, and some of the higher of the old tidal channels across the Coastal Ridge came into use as discharge channels. Thus modern, natural drainage was affected. Short streams such as Miami River, Arch Creek, New River, and others established their modern form.
A Broward engineer, C. K. Davis, tells me that two great discharge channels, each two or three miles wide and ninety feet or more deep (now filled with sand, of course), existed in the Hallandale-Ojus and North Dade coastal areas.

New River Valley cut through the Coastal Ridge between Dania and Fort Lauderdale. The maximum depth to solid rock is one hundred feet. The Coastal Ridge is seven miles wide and New River Valley is the deepest of all Pleistocene cuts in S. E. Florida. The Atlantic Coastal Ridge is seven miles wide between the sandy flat lands and Everglades on the west and the ocean on the east. Its greatest height is about fifty feet in sand dome summits formed during the Pleistocene epoch. In Broward the Ridge is chiefly of sandy oolitic stone, and is riddled with vertical solution holes.

New River could possibly have come overnight, or it could have been an underground stream in a solution channel in the lime rock. Probably the truth lies somewhere between the “overnight legend,” and what could have happened to a formation like Middle River in Broward which fell in and gradually enlarged.

New River is a long, narrow body of water, which makes many twists and turns. It is difficult to imagine that what could happen at one of its extremities, or the other, or in its mid-sections, would of necessity happen simultaneously over its entire length. It is difficult to imagine a disturbance so great and a weakness of an overhead roof so uniform, around so many twists and bends for several miles, that it all happened at once.

However, the limestone is not of too recent origin to have allowed for the formation of an underground channel. New River had to drain through all the formations of the Coastal Ridge. When the ’Glades waters were forced to seek a way out to the ocean they had to find a way over, around, through, or under them. These waters could well have gone underground to Tarpon Bend down in Central Fort Lauderdale.

New River has been there a long, long time. As the ’Glades
got bigger and bigger it became a major outlet. As the Spaniards used to ask "¿Quien sabe?" Who knows?

Water does dissolve limestone and creates underground streams in places. This is limestone country. It is doubtful, however, that the river appeared overnight.

Some years back an engineer, wondering about the underwater flow from the 'Glades, made an experiment. He put dye into the water to color it. This colored water did show up on the coast, but it took it a long, long time, too long for such a large volume as is carried by New River, in his opinion.

Hence the legend of its overnight occurrence could be true. There was a layer of rock on top, six or eight feet thick; and the water was many feet down. This roof could have fallen in, and kept on falling like lined up dominoes to which some one gave a push. Earth hereabouts is not solid. In some spots in Fort Lauderdale engineers have had to go down one hundred feet with piling, seeking solid support and close by that spot they have only had to go down a distance of ten feet.

In Cypress strands in the 'Glades the water goes through the surface growth or sometimes underneath the surface and then comes back up. There is strong geological reasoning to sustain the belief that New River, Miami River, and Arch Creek have occupied their present positions many, many years. Depths are the result of the down-cutting of their channels before the climate optimum some thousands of years ago when the sea stood lower on the continental shelf.

Did New River come over night? Or didn’t it? There is good argument both ways.

Let’s look at the river as it was in the past. In front of the Pioneer House (at the tunnel on U. S. One) the river was once forty or fifty feet deep with pot holes on the white, sandy bottom. These pot holes had arches like cathedrals. Fish swam in and out, calm and unhurried. The water was crystal clear.
Old timers used to go west to fish in the pool below the small water falls where the river originated from the 'Glades. That pool was clear as crystal, too. Ferns drooped over the rock edges. It was a serene place of exquisite, infinite beauty.

What a picture can be conjured by the modes of transporta­tion on the river over the years: Ponce de Leon sailing past its entrance on a Spanish Galleon with all her sails set; a seminole, poling his dugout, loaded with all his family, his dog, skins, hides, and possessions; the blood-thirsty Indian War party which assassinated Mrs. Cooley, her three children and their tutor; and Major Lauderdale and his 500 Tennessee volunteers seeking a place to build Fortress Lauderdale. Capt. “Dynamite” Johnny O’Bryan of Napolean Bonaparte Broward’s Three Friends and her sister tug, the Dauntless, trying to avoid Spanish and American war craft beyond the inlet. (O’Bryan ran ammunition and supplies to Cubans from Jacksonville and other Florida ports before the start of the Spanish American War.) Frank Stranahan’s old Ferry which hauled passengers and their horses and wagons across the river as they made their way south to Miami. Charles B. Cory’s famous old Mississippi River houseboat, the Wanderer, with its mahogany panelling, its cases of fine guns, and its luxurious accommodations for the distinguished guests who loved to visit, hunt, and fish on New River. The small craft of our first medical man, “the Little Doctor,” Dr. Thomas Kennedy, who rowed to his patients up and down the waterway.

New River was important to the Indians, and to the United States when it was fighting the Seminoles. Military records show that it was a main highway from the coast to the hinterlands.

After the North New River Canal was dug stern-wheeler steamboats made trips to Lake Okeechobee and down the Caloosahatchee to Fort Meyers, and freighters came from the Big Lake, many loaded with Okeechobee catfish, for icing at the F.E.C. R.R. docks at Fort Lauderdale. We once had the
North New River Canal, Lake Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee Navigation District.

Then to the river came the fine yachts of millionaire sportsmen and travellers. There were the great Charter Boat fleet of Big Game fishing guides; and the rakish, high-speed boats of rum runners, highjackers, Coast Guardsmen, and border patrolmen who were active on the river in the days of National Prohibition. That was a rough period of Fort Lauderdale history, and the county was sometimes called “Bloody Broward.”

New River was famed for its fishing fleet and the fish which were taken. A daily afternoon event of the tourist season was for everybody to go downtown to the New River docks to watch the fishing fleet come in and to see the catches.

Once Capt. Jay Gould came in with a Manta, a so-called Devil Fish, that must have weighed 5,000 pounds. It measured twenty-three feet across from the wing tip to wing tip. A small boy could have climbed down inside its mouth. Once harpooned, the huge Ray towed the Captain’s boat backwards across the ocean while the motor was racing full-speed forward. High powered rifles finally subdued it. When the Captain and helpers rigged a block and tackle and tried to haul it out of the river at the Andrews Avenue display racks its great weight broke down the wooden docks. A Powell Company dragline was finally required to get it up to the display rack.

Great schools of good-eating King Mackerel were frequently common off the beach. Kings, after a run, would be stacked like cordwood on the downtown broadwalk. You’d insult anyone if you offered him a King that hadn’t been cleaned.

In 1919 Captain J. B. Vreeland and his father, who had been keeper of the House of Refuge on the Beach, came in with six magnificent sailfish taken on handlines. The Sail has a tremendous dorsal fin that raises from a slot in its back. They were complete oddities, never having been seen here before.

(I have since heard it argued that no sailfish got over here from the Pacific until after the Panama Canal was opened. I
have also heard it said that none were taken before because the fishermen simply hadn’t learned how to hook them!

It should be pointed out that whereas Dade County had long appreciated the value of tourists (Flagler had built one of his great resort hotels in Miami, the Royal Palm), Fort Lauderdale and Broward County were agriculturally oriented and looked to the west. The New River people looked to the drainage of the Everglades, and declared that once the water was removed from muck lands, called richer than the valley of the Nile, they would produce the vegetables and crops that would literally feed the world. They felt that the one-track F.E.C. Railroad couldn’t begin to haul all this produce north. That was when the dream of a deep-water, world port, from which Port Everglades later resulted, came into being.

But the 'Glades didn’t drain and by 1915 a timid bid was made for tourists. A Fort Lauderdale resort hotel was somehow financed and a Miami architect, August Geiger, designed it. It was ready for the 1919-20 season. It was the new Broward on Andrews Avenue and it overlooked New River. The first guests were D. W. Griffith, most famous motion picture producer of his day, who came with his entire troop including Richard Barthelmess, Creighton Hale, Ford Sterling, Carol Dempster and a host of camera, property, and technical men. Griffith came because of the mystery and beauty of New River, and he made jungle and south seas pictures.

Until Port Everglades was built and its jetties projected out into the ocean New River had no permanent mouth, another of the mysterious features of the river. The old inlet was about where the Yankee Clipper Hotel is now.

Biological life on the river was wonderful. Even in recent times long flights of white ibis would fly down the river’s length in big “Vees” to roosting places on islands in New River sound.

Common further to the west on the river were egrets, heron, osprey, woodpeckers, including the big red, black, and white pileated woodpeckers which resembled and were almost as
large as the now extinct ivory bill. Alligators were to be seen sunning on the banks as soon as one passed the Seaboard right of way. There were turtles and that strange marine creature, the big but harmless manatee. In earlier days tarpon and shark would sweep into New River with schools of other fish with the tide.

There were tall trees garlanded with flowering vines and air plants and native orchids, all so beautiful and photogenic when D. W. Griffith came to make his “Classmates” and the “Idol Dancer” and “Broken Blossoms” and other famous silent films.

Where nature can be most benign, it can also be most violent. The great 1926 hurricane with its fierce winds blowing in from the east, stopped the tide from going out and New River left its banks and spread out over most of downtown Ft. Lauderdale.

Values do change. People become complacent. We are inclined to take a thing for granted. Even New River! But next to the ocean itself, New River and New River Sound and the system of artificial, interlocking waterways are Fort Lauderdale’s most distinguishing feature and set it apart from any other city in the world. New River is completely distinctive.

The first mansion in Fort Lauderdale, now called the Pioneer House, was built by Frank Stranahan for his bride, Ivy Cromartie of Lemon City, the first school teacher. Hundreds of other homes and fine estates later were built along the reaches of this beautiful stream. Today there is a grocery store next to the Pioneer House, and its back end is against the Riverfront and the view there adds little to the aesthetic values of Fort Lauderdale.

We have killed most of the alligators. There are few of the big wading birds. We have brought in salt water. The vegetation of the tropics has been removed as we become more and
more urban. That is to be expected. It is inevitable that some of the charm and values we once prized will disappear as we grow. But there are important features that can and should be preserved.

It was in 1907 that the first serious modification of the natural equilibrium between fresh water and salt water was undertaken by man. Dredging operations, part of a statewide drainage program, were started at that time in the New River Basin at Fort Lauderdale. By 1909 dredging had started in the Miami River, and by 1910 a ten-foot channel had been opened from Miami, through the fall line or rapids, and was extended several miles into the Everglades.

Water, formerly ponded behind the Coastal Ridge and stored within the rocks of the Coastal Ridge itself, was free to waste through the canals to the ocean. We now have a vast complex of canals and so-called reclamation areas which, to some, represents a large waste of land and taxes. What we seem to have been doing is diverting life-giving water from public lands to private profit.

Today New River is polluted. You can water-ski in it, but as is wryly said, “for Heaven’s sake, don’t fall in.” Its waters are made turbid with debris from rock mining to the west.

Some fatalistic souls feel that the loss of beauty and attractiveness which New River has suffered is an inevitable concomitant of growth. They feel that such loss is the price of progress. Demands on the waterway are great, and growing greater, and are strains on its natural attractiveness. But its charm can be preserved if a proper eye is kept on the future.

“Ding” Darling, the famed Herald Tribune cartoonist, once drew two parallel pictures. One showed a single Indian scalping a single man. The other showed a figure called Civilization, that is, you and me; and Civilization was wielding a bloody axe, scalping the whole North American continent, yanking off trees and top soil and entire forests. The broad question, and it’s an uncomfortable one, is whether, if we wantonly
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destroy the rest of nature we may not end up destroying ourselves?

We need rivers and wilderness and natural things, some place where we can escape from our own turmoil, noise, and litter. There is much of scenic and historic interest on New River that should be preserved. A lesson could be learned from what has happened to once beautiful Miami River.

The immediate concern of Fort Lauderdale should be the protection of this river which has helped give it the title: “Most beautiful city in the world”. We need a commission, or board or an authority to protect and preserve it and maintain its values.

There is always need for scientific study and management if we are to preserve the pioneer tradition in our urbanized and industrial society. We have made the mess, dumped the filth and poison in our environment. Unless we learn to clean up some of it we will have to live with it, with unknown consequence for our own health and that of our descendants.

New River needs to be cleaned up. It hasn’t deteriorated too far, yet; but studies are needed to maintain and preserve it.

More than 50 American cities have taken steps to improve long neglected riverfronts. The value of these riverfronts, economically and aesthetically, is recognized today as never before.

Let us take an example from a close neighbor. Nine separate governmental jurisdictions on four different levels, federal, state, county, and municipal, have regulatory powers over the use of Miami River and abutting land; the U. S. Government, the Central and South Florida Flood Control District, Metropolitan Dade, the cities of Miami, Hialeah, and Miami Springs, and the towns of Medley, Hialeah Gardens, and Pennsuco. Most jurisdictions contain two or more sub-units which exercise authority over some part of the waterways.
A planning study of the Miami River prepared by the Metropolitan Planning Department in April, 1962, contained in its list of illustrations such scenes as “A Mass of Floating Debris,” “One of Several Abandoned Hulks,” “Rusting Derelict Resting on River Bottom,” “Open Dump in Palmer Lake,” “River View Along Junk Yard Row,” and “Boating In The Shadow of Scrap Mountain.”

The study also showed “Long Range Land Use Plans for East and West of Proposed Le Juene Expressway,” “Example of a Well-Bulkheaded Shoreline,” “High Density Land Use at Mouth of Miami River,” and “Future High Rise Apartment Building on Miami River.”

Dade County recognizes its problems with Miami River. Article XX, Chapter Two, the Metropolitan Code, establishes an Advisory Board to provide information, advice and counsel in respect to feasible objectives which may be appropriately sought to improve the appearance and usefulness of Miami River, as well as to plan for its future development.

The problem of making the river attractive and clean is compounded by the multitude of governmental jurisdictions exercising authority over lands adjacent to the river. Need for intergovernmental cooperation is obvious.

Efforts to improve the river definitely are being made.

An outstanding riverfront success story is Riverwalk in San Antonio, a project for the last five and half years of the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce.

In 1964 citizens included $300,000 in a $30,000,000 municipal improvement bond issue for downtown San Antonio River Bend.

Approval of the feature, unprecedented for San Antonio, was a clear indication that property owners recognized the tremendous economic and aesthetic potential of the city’s most outstanding physical feature, the river, and were willing to pay tax monies to develop the potential.

Historically San Antonians had not always taken such keen interest in their River, nor had they looked upon its potential
so favorably. There was serious talk at one time of covering the stream with concrete for a street above, with the bed serving as a sewer. Fortunately, this did not occur. The Chamber of Commerce set up a Tourist Attraction Committee and recommended a feasibility study of potential river renovation, a study completed in 1961.

In 1962 the city council created a River Walk Commission, with power to act in an advisory capacity. The rest is now known to the world. Ten restaurants, antique shops and clubs have been completed. Twelve buildings are under renovation. Space for thirty more establishments is being provided. Landscaping outstanding.

Private capital, exclusive of land acquisition, going into renovation is in excess of $2,500,000.

Each year San Antonio plays host to several million visitors. “Something to do” must be provided for them if San Antonio is to take its rightful place in a tremendously competitive field. Complete development of El Paseo del Rio San Antonio will provide this “something” which no other city in the nation can match, is the beautiful Texas city’s legitimate claim.

An excellent survey was made of Fort Lauderdale’s New River by the Colorado Corporation, several years ago, for the Urban Renewal Plan since seemingly abandoned. Nothing has happened.

More lately the city’s engineering department has made smaller studies, some of which included the use of divers to determine how badly sea walls had eroded, or been undermined. Many were found to be in bad shape.

Victor Gruen, Real Estate Research Corporation of New York and Los Angeles, has been engaged to study New River as a part of the work he is doing for the Downtown Council. His report, due sometime in the fall of 1967, is being looked forward to with anticipation.

In Fort Lauderdale itself are several planners and landscape experts capable of making studies of the stream on which Fort Lauderdale had turned its back.
Historically, New River was the focal point of Fort Lauderdale long before interest became centered on the beach. But more than forty years have passed since Fort Lauderdale adopted, 717 to 63, a $3,340,000 bond issue to take care of municipal needs which included $250,000 for New River docks, parkways, and other waterfront improvements. That money was voted August 3, 1926.

It is high time, this many years later, that positive action be taken on recommendations and findings recently made. An updating program is imperative.

Fort Lauderdale’s New River has the potential, and the possibility, to equal and to exceed anything claimed for the San Antonio River, or any other stream in any other municipality anywhere.

Perhaps the real mystery is not whether the New River came overnight but rather, what in the world has happened to the civic pride of the people of Fort Lauderdale that they would allow this stream to deteriorate any way, and that they are not providing for, and insisting on, every possible safeguard for the future of this world-famous attraction and this greatest of assets. New River is still beautiful and appealing, but it needs and demands and is entitled to more attention than it presently receives.

The time to begin showing this care and attention was years ago.

The next best bet is to start today.
Aerial view of downtown Fort Lauderdale showing portion of New River.
There is great potential for a riverfront of charm and beauty.
On New River, Fort Lauderdale.
There is much of scenic interest that should be preserved.
Walks along the river at San Antonio.
This might have been a covered sewer. Who would have preferred that?
The Death-of-God Theologians: an Assessment

DON E. MARIETTA, JR.

This paper is not titled "The Death-of-God Movement" by design. A movement should have far more organization, or, at least, common principles and collaboration than we have seen so far. There has been some talk of a movement, but aside from one book composed of previously and individually written articles there has been no joint effort. Aside from the striking words "the death of God," a commitment to a secular perspective, and an emphasis on Christology, the death-of-God theologians have little in common. Even those things which they have in common are far from being the exclusive possessions of these theologians. A significant number of theologians are committed to a secular perspective and have rejected any concept of a supernatural reality, yet do not use the term "death of God" nor consider their thinking to be similar to the theologies which do use the term. Others who use the term employ it in a significantly different way.

This points up the problem of deciding who is a death-of-God theologian. I exclude Dietrich Bonhoeffer even though the death-of-God theologians look to him as a sort of forerunner. Bonhoeffer wrote, "... we must live in the world as if there were no God." But he went on to say, "God himself drives us to this realization ... We stand continually in the presence of the God who makes us live in the world without the God-
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Bonhoeffer seemed to have had a very radical concept of God, but being deceased was not part of the description.

Gabriel Vahanian helped popularize the term “death of God,” but he was talking about a social phenomenon which he considered harmful and unwarranted. Harvey Cox emphatically denies being a God-is-dead thinker.

Paul M. Van Buren, on the other hand, does not talk of the death of God and says he cannot even understand one of the leading God-is-dead theologians; but he is generally considered a God-is-dead theologian, and I believe he should be studied as such. He might protest being included, and I grant that he has grounds for protesting.

One of the most willing members of the death-of-God group is William Hamilton. He would like to create a God-is-dead movement. He is the chronicler and interpreter of the would-be movement. A lucid writer, he clarifies the basic principles of a radical theology and the various possible meanings of the slogan “God is dead.”

Hamilton means by the death of God much more than the failure of religious language, the death of the word “God.” He speaks of “the deterioration of the portrait of the God-man relation as found in biblical theology . . .” This is not a way of talking about man’s loss of faith. The death of God does not mean that the capacity for faith has been lost. It is not a statement about ourselves. It is a statement about the nature of the world. “We are not talking about the absence of the experience of God, but about the experience of the absence of God.” We are talking about a loss of real transcendence. “It is a loss of God.”

3“The Death of God Theologies Today,” The Christian Scholar, 1965; also in Radical Theology and the Death of God.
4“The Death of God Theologies Today” p. 27f.
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Hamilton does not speak of the death of God as an event. God’s death is not the event proclaimed by Nietzsche’s madman. Hamilton considers the death of God more a metaphor to describe “something that is happening to a particular group of modern western Christians today.” He is not willing, however, to equate his metaphor of death with other phrases used in contemporary writing about God, such as the absence of God, eclipse, or God being hidden.

This explanation of the metaphorical use of the death of God and its contrast to other metaphors along with the rejection of the death of God as an event and its description as “something that is happening to a particular group of modern Western Christians today” indicates that Hamilton is talking about the inability of secular man to believe in a transcendent reality. But if this is the correct interpretation of his meaning, what does he mean when he says the death of God is a statement about the nature of the world?

If this seems confusing or contradictory, we are not helped in clarifying the matter when Hamilton describes these radical theologians as “men without God who do not anticipate his return,” but at the same time speaks of “our waiting for God” and sees this waiting as mainly a search for some mode of living and speaking that will enable us to stand before him again.

Perhaps this confusion can be blamed on the fact that Hamilton has not written a book explaining his own point of view. His work consists of journal and magazine articles, most of which are descriptions of what Hamilton sees as a death-of-God movement. His own creative work is found in some interesting study of the writing of Dostoevsky, especially The Brothers Karamazov. Hamilton tends to identify with Ivan, whom he does not interpret as an atheist; but this writing still

---

6Ibid.
7“Radicalism and the Death of God,” in Radical Theology.
8“The Death of God Theologies Today.”
does not indicate clearly Hamilton’s own interpretation of the death of God.⁹

In addition to the absence of God, Hamilton finds in death-of-God theology two other main themes. One is an emphasis on Christology. Even though each God-is-dead theologian does stress Jesus, or Christ, in some way, no two of them have the same approach. The differences are marked. Hamilton is rather optimistic about our knowledge of the historical life of Jesus. As we wait for God we must serve the world and our fellow man in obedience to Jesus’ command. This is, for Hamilton, our justification for calling ourselves Christians even though we do not believe in God.¹⁰

The other main theme is optimism. This is seen in doctrines of sin which do not stress man’s evil nature or which make salvation mainly a matter of escaping from sin. More significantly, it is seen in a joyful acceptance of new technology, automation, and rapid social change.¹¹

Thomas J. J. Altizer’s approach to the death of God bears little resemblance to the prosaic work of Hamilton. Altizer was influenced by Hegel, Nietzsche, and William Blake; and his development of radical theology builds upon the thought of these men. Altizer has done important work in the field of history of religions, especially the role of myth. This also enriches his treatment of the death of God. In addition to the greater depth of Altizer’s work, it is the work of a man with poetical and mystical capacities which Hamilton seems to lack. In addition to numerous articles, Altizer wrote The Gospel of Christian Atheism.

Unlike Hamilton, Altizer picks up Nietzsche’s proclamation of the death of God as an event. He says, “We must realize that the death of God is an historical event, that God has died in our cosmos, in our history, in our Existenz.”¹² This event,

⁹Radical Theology and the Death of God, pp. 53-84.
¹⁰“The Shape of Radical Theology” and “The Death of God Theology Today.”
¹¹“The Shape of Radical Theology.”
¹²Radical Theology and the Death of God. p. 11.
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the death of God, took place in the Incarnation and the Crucifixion of Jesus.

Altizer interprets the Incarnation of God in the human Jesus as a “kenosis” (an emptying). This is based on Philippians 2:7 which says that the second person of the Holy Trinity “emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men.” Altizer interprets this kenosis as an act in which not only the second person of the Trinity, but the whole transcendent deity became incarnate in the human person Jesus. This is not, to be sure, the orthodox interpretation of the Incarnation. Even a stress on kenosis in regard to the second person of the Trinity has found few champions in orthodoxy. Altizer’s idea that the whole being of God was incarnate in Jesus is radical indeed, but he believes it is the only way to take the doctrine of the Incarnation with unsurpassed seriousness and consistency. He comes to this conclusion, not from theological reasons, but from philosophical reasons based on Hegel’s thought, as we shall see in more detail shortly.

God completely abandoned therefore, his primordial nature, his transcendent holiness, when he revealed himself in the Holy Incarnation. Since God entered wholly into Jesus, instead of saying that Jesus is God, we should say that God is Jesus. Altizer follows Hegel in this interpretation of the Incarnation. Spirit becomes flesh. The dialectical movement is from God’s transcendence toward immanence. God negates himself as spirit to become flesh. This is interpreted in Hegelian terms as a “coincidentia oppositorum.” God as transcendent spirit

15Ibid. p. 103.
remains himself as he negates his primordial nature and becomes his opposite. This dialectical movement is not reversible. It was not limited to the one action in the Incarnation.

This dialectical process is a gradual metamorphosis of spirit into flesh; it is a divine process which continually negating itself in moving toward an eschatological goal. Though this process is initiated in its final form in the events of the Incarnation and the Crucifixion, the process itself does not end with the Crucifixion, for neither of these can be understood simply as isolated events at points in time.

Altizer holds that the doctrine of the Resurrection of Jesus in its usual form is a retraction, a taking back, of the Incarnation. He rejects, therefore, the idea that Jesus was resurrected to return to a position of glory as a heavenly spiritual being. Such a return would revoke the Incarnation, and also would be an impossible backward movement which Hegelian thought could not accept. What happened then? Altizer says Jesus passed by his death from a particular to a universal form, and thus “continues to be present in a forward moving and transfiguring Word.”

That term “the Word” (Altizer capitalizes “Word”) becomes very important to his atheistic gospel. The Word is the present state of what began as a holy, transcendent, spiritual God. Some ideas from The Gospel of Christian Atheism will show what Altizer means by the Word. The Word is not limited either to Jesus or to “the exalted Christ.” The Word is Jesus who is present in what Blake calls experience, who is “fully incarnate in every human hand and face.” The Word is not in the “natural man” but in a “new humanity . . . created by the death of God in Jesus.” This humanity is one contrary to the natural man who is imprisoned in his own selfhood and in time. The Word “appears wherever there is energy and life.”

16Ibid, pp. 46f, 103.
17Ibid. pp. 107, 92, 109f.
18Ibid. pp. 52, 102f.
19Ibid. p. 56.
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Incarnate Word has a forward movement from God to Jesus and continues from the historical Jesus to the universal body of humanity. No point in this process is one where we can isolate the Word and say here it is in its "definitive expression."\(^{20}\)

Altizer treats the theological themes of the fall of man, sin, and redemption mythically. He employs the mythical themes in the writings of William Blake which picture God as Satan or find Satan as the dead, emptied body of the transcendent God who entered totally (the kenosis idea) into Jesus.\(^{21}\) The dead, empty body of God is related to the repressiveness of absolute morality, to "no-saying," to the isolation of the individual human being in his selfhood. Isolation or alienation is the fall and original sin. Redemption comes with a "self-annihilation" which abolishes the distance between people and the alienation between man and the cosmos. It makes possible the transformation of Satan (i.e. the dead God) into "The Great Humanity Divine." When humanity has passed through the cosmic "self-annihilation" God is revealed in his Satanic form and every memory of sin is forgotten. Law and guilt and consciousness of sin are abolished.\(^{22}\) This is the participation of humanity in the death of God. Humanity goes through the same process of self-annihilation which God underwent. The culmination is "The Great Humanity Divine." Blake's vision (which becomes Altizer's myth) is not a poetical way of talking about individual human salvation. It is an apocalyptic vision of the redemption of the cosmos.

When Altizer talks about the role of the individual Christian who accepts the death of God, he is not concerned about sin and has no need for a mythical presentation. The Christian should welcome the death of God. His salvation lies in "yes-saying" to "the moment before us." He calls upon the Christian to make a wager. His understanding of the act of faith is similar to that of Pascal, even though his world-view is radically

\(^{20}\)Ibid. pp. 72, 75, 83.
\(^{21}\)Ibid. pp. 97-101, 112-131, 139-147.
\(^{22}\)Ibid. pp. 124-128.
different from Pascal’s. He says that radical faith makes us give ourselves completely to the world and to affirm the fullness of the present moment as the life and energy of Christ. In this way the wager of the radical Christian is ultimately a wager about the actual presence of Christ who is incarnate love.\textsuperscript{23}

Thomas Altizer is the one theologian who merits the title death-of-God theologian. He alone clearly affirms that there once was a transcendent creator God who is now dead. He speaks clearly of the death of God as an event. He fearlessly accepts the atheism of our times and presents a gospel which receives its philosophical grounding in Hegel and its religious zeal in the Promethean optimism of Nietzsche and Blake. It is a fascinating theology which will be received with joy by some people, with horror by others.

One primary concern should be Altizer’s use of Hegel. Does he really develop Hegelian insights or simply use Hegel’s words and thoughts to shore up a non-Hegelian edifice? I believe he has made a legitimate use of Hegel; but his thought would be more consistently Hegelian if he made the Word to be a synthesis in which the thesis (God’s primordial nature) and the antithesis (flesh, immanence) are unified and realized on a higher level.

Several matters related to the philosophy of religion disturb me about Altizer’s theology.

I am bothered by his belief that a transcendent, supernatural, spiritual God once existed but is now dead. The modern thought with which Altizer is trying to come to terms simply does not believe that such a God ever existed. This is true not only of the atheists but of the many theologians who believe in God but find the supernaturalistic approach utterly meaningless. It has been said that Altizer and the most conservative theologians agree completely in their description of God until it comes to the matter of his health.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid. pp. 147-157.
If Altizer is talking about the death of a God who never existed his work may be a means to get people to think about some important concerns, but it can hardly be accepted as a significant contribution. If theologians are finally beginning to discover the nature of God in terms and concepts meaningful to modern man, i.e. a non-supernatural understanding of God, then this is the area in which to work, not talking of the death of God, but seeking to understand the manner of God’s living.

Perhaps Altizer is doing just this with his concept of “the Word.” He does not give the title God to the Word. When he describes the Word, however, he sounds as though he is talking about what some other theologians mean when they say God. Since a god by any other name is just as alive, I do not believe that Altizer, in final analysis, is the atheist he claims to be.

Paul M. van Buren stands in sharp contrast to the mystical, poetic Altizer. He is systematic, logical and unemotional. He grounds his theology not in Hegelian, or any other, metaphysical system, but in analytical philosophy. In addition to journal articles he wrote The Secular Meaning of the Gospel.

Van Buren believes that a secular interpretation of the Christian gospel is not only possible, but is in keeping with the main intention and value of historic statements of doctrine. He holds that modern theology has a responsibility to its past. His main interest is Christology. He contends that his contemporary interpretation based on linguistic analysis, although it discards the wording, preserves the meaning of the New Testament Christology (which he interprets in terms of “call and response”), and the Christology of the fourth and fifth-century Church councils.

By means of linguistic analysis van Buren seeks to discover the meaning of theological statements. He holds that theological language has meaning if it is understood in terms of the “language game” to which it belongs.

---

Van Buren’s theology is completely secular. He believes that literal theism is false and qualified literal theism is meaningless (an example of the latter is Schubert Ogden’s definition of God as “experienced non-objective reality”). Van Buren builds upon the work of R. M. Hare, I. T. Ramsey, and R. B. Braithwaite. He interprets Christian faith as a “blick,” a perspective entailing a commitment. So understood, i.e., in that language game, religious language not only has meaning, but is verifiable (by action consistent with the “blick”). Religious language is language of “discernment and commitment.”

Van Buren is critical of religious existentialist interpretations of the gospel, such as that of Bultmann and Ogden, because they neglect the role of history. Historical events, especially the life of Jesus and more especially the Easter event, are essential to a Christian interpretation. History, and for Christians the story of Jesus and Easter, provided a “discernment situation” (Ramsey’s phrase). The Christian’s “blick” is a discernment of meaning and a “commitment arising out of his study of one piece of history which influences the way in which he looks at the rest of history and also his own life.”

The story of Jesus reveals him, to van Buren, as “a remarkably free man.” He was free from the fears, need for authority, need to establish his identity, etc., which mark the common man. He was free to be compassionate and open to other people. He was free to be what Bonhoeffer called “the man for others.”

Van Buren explains the significance of Easter in terms of Jesus’ freedom. The disciples became aware for the first time of that freedom of Jesus in themselves. Their Easter experience was their own “subjective” experience, but one in a way quite new to them. In it they found themselves sharing in Jesus’ freedom, something which they had never found before. “We

25 Ibid. pp. 91-97, 100f.
26 Ibid. p. 113, also pp. 11f, 114f.
27 Ibid. p. 121ff.
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might say that, on Easter, the freedom of Jesus began to be contagious.”

The Christian expression of faith, “Jesus is Lord,” is similarly understood. One who says “Jesus is Lord,” says that what happened on Easter has exercised a liberating effect on him. He has been so gripped by it, it has become the norm for his perspective on life. His confession in a notice of this perspective and a recommendation to others to see Jesus, the world, and himself in the same way.

Van Buren interprets other doctrinal statements in a way which is in keeping with a secular perspective. The doctrine of creation, for example, expresses “an affirmative view of the world and all things” as opposed to a world-denying or dualistic view. Van Buren carefully interprets most basic Christian doctrines in a secular fashion by means of linguistic analysis.

Van Buren’s approach to theology is not without problems. The use of linguistic analysis on doctrinal statements involves the peril of subjectively reading into a doctrine a meaning which was not there originally. A paraphrase or model designed to indicate the meaning of a statement may say more about the analyst than it says about the original statement. Van Buren’s stress on the freedom of Jesus needs some corroboration. When the disciples said “He is risen” they may not have been talking about freedom. Perhaps van Buren should take into consideration P. H. Nowell-Smith’s idea of contextual implication.

Van Buren seems to me to be somewhat inconsistent, or perhaps simply not clear enough, in regard to the empirical content of biblical language, especially in the gospels. His criticism of Bultmann and Ogden for ignoring the empirical aspect of statements about verifiable events seems to conflict with his own treatment of such statements. Also, I am not
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satisfied with his treatment of events which, though not verifiable in practice, were the sort of occurrence which could have been verified at the time they happened. These belong, it seems to me, in the language game of other physical descriptions, even if they have implications which have a bearing on the subject matter of language games dealing with non-empirical meaning. Van Buren indicates that he is aware of this problem when he says that his interpretation of Easter as a catching of Jesus’ freedom is used “to point to the event of Easter, not of course to describe it.”

Even though van Buren might not belong among the God is dead theologians, his gospel of Christian atheism is more successful on three counts than Altizer’s. Robert McAfee Brown says of Altizer’s book that it is not a gospel, not atheism, and not Christian. Brown is at least partly right on all three points. Van Buren’s gospel is probably more understandable. Certainly it does not need to rely on modern myths. One may question the interpretation given, but van Buren certainly grounds his gospel in scripture and the Christian theological tradition. He makes the life of Jesus and the Easter event crucial to his gospel, which Altizer does not do. Van Buren is the most complete secularist of the God-is-dead group. Whether van Buren is an atheist is a question of definition. He does not speak of a Word at work in the world and he is not waiting for God to return; however van Buren does not court the designation of atheist for himself. He would probably reject for himself the pejorative implications of the term. He strongly defends himself against the view typified by Anthony Flew which would designate as non-Christian the interpretation of Christianity as a “blik” rather than as an acceptance of the traditional expressions of Christian faith. I believe he is thoroughly justified in this and on the basis of principles which an analytic philosopher should accept. Unless one abandons the insight that the meaning of

\[32\text{Ibid. p. 133.}\]
words is determined by their use and resorts in this special case to what Gilbert Ryle calls the “ghost in the machine” interpretation of words, van Buren’s use of the term Christian faith for his view must be accepted. Unless only clerks and waiters, businessmen and lawyers are privileged to make language, the way religious philosophers use religious terms will create the meaning of such terms. There are far too many theologians interpreting religious faith in something other than the traditional terms and concepts to hold that faith interpreted as a “blik” is either meaningless or non-Christian.
Automation and Craftsmanship

JAMES M. HARTLEY

THE GOLDEN era of craftsmanship occurred during the late Middle Ages. This was the time of the craft guilds when skills were passed from father to son, and boys entered the guilds at an early age to learn their trades thoroughly through long apprenticeships. Craftsmen then were proud of their abilities, and rightfully so, for they reached a perfection very seldom seen today. This guild system exists to a lesser extent in Europe today.

Unfortunately, in our own society good craftsmen are more the exception than the rule. The fault for this falls squarely on the shoulders of the buying public, who neither recognize nor demand quality workmanship in the things they buy, lease, or live in. Ours is an economy of massive consumption where items are built to last only a few years so that the people must buy and buy.

Today is a time of startling change in the rapid growth of the technology of automation. While automation is accomplishing marvelous things for the well being and comfort of man it is also doing away with his work. The U. S. Department of Labor estimates that automation is now eliminating jobs at the rate of about forty thousand a week. This coupled with the need of nearly two million additional jobs each year for the ever-increasing supply of new workers, has created a major dilemma. Society is beginning to run out of work. It has lately become apparent that automation is not going to create new
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and different jobs in any quantity to replace those which it eliminates. Moreover, the automation of labor is now entering a more advanced stage. The development of servo-mechanics, an even more sophisticated process, in which almost every work task can be automated, is not far away.

A major social problem is facing the nation as a result of the forward projection of technology which is aimed in the direction of all the work in the country being done by only a few people. This notion is a little terrifying. The nation has already entered an era in which the work force and the work week are being steadily reduced. Within the next fifteen to twenty years automation will have reached a point where all of the goods and services needed by the nation may be produced by as little as twenty percent of the available labor force.

What has all this to do with craftsmanship? Consider man’s life when his work week consists of two days with the other five allocated to uncommitted time. Psychiatrists tell us that man’s greatest joy and drive is the feeling of accomplishment of a job well done. What then is man’s goal when his work occupies but a small part of his life? What will he do to justify his existence and maintain his dignity as a productive individual?

As I see it there are three avenues open to him. One, of course, is continuing education, possibly throughout an entire lifetime. But, understandably our schools and universities can accommodate only a segment of our expanding population.

The second avenue is recreation. But would man really feel much satisfaction from sports or recreation that were a steady diet five days a week? Could he, with this life of leisure, achieve the self-fulfillment he so sorely needs?

The third avenue, of course, is craftsmanship in the fullest sense of the word — ability to create objects of beauty and originality through one’s physical dexterity and skills. This includes not only painting and sculpting but fine woodwork and masonry, for in essence are not all artists craftsmen and are not all craftsmen artists?
In this era, with its emphasis on theoretical knowledge, what are we doing to develop these skills? Not enough, I am afraid. Some educators are endeavoring to rekindle interest in the crafts. They realize education is neglecting the development of manipulative skills and want to provide such training for the dexterity it brings and for its value as a leisure time hobby.

So, what will we do when we live in this golden age of the future when almost every work task is automated? Even now, we have typewriters we talk to instead of operate, facsimile machines which print the newspaper right in the living room and one does not even have to go outside to pick it up, electric knives and scissors, automatic doors and windows, moving sidewalks and stairs, electric toothbrushes, pre-cooked and portioned foods. And there will be more of such things in the future. So, when we finally reach this golden age, when all tasks are done for us through automation and we have countless hours of uncommitted time, if we have not developed crafts and skills, what are we going to do with our hands, what are we going to do to make life satisfying?
THE ANNALS of American education are full of many strange anecdotes, and none is more amusing than that which involved the Irishman, George Berkeley (pronounced Bark-ley, of course) in the early years of the eighteenth century. Berkeley dreamed of establishing a college in the new world. How much further than this vague idea he had thought out his plan is unknown. For Berkeley was a strange and unusual person. An Irish Anglican, (a breed that seems almost a contradiction in terms) he was at the time Dean of Derry, and later in life was to become a bishop. As a young man he had written some philosophical tracts to demonstrate the non-existence of material substance. In popular words he contended that physical stuff, such as the chair I am sitting on now, is but an idea in a mind, probably mine, but at least God's. (Only a bull-headed Irishman, of that race that believes in the existence of leprechauns, could argue so convincingly but unpersuasively for such a notion.) But that is not all. The lady who was called Vanessa by the Irish satirist, Swift, left Berkeley half of her estate on her death, though as far as we know the two had met only once at a dinner party. (This ardent churchman was either a lady's man or a successful fund raiser!) Anyhow, to get back to our story, the Dean succeeded in soliciting some private funds for his proposed college, and was promised £20,000 by the British government. With some money in hand and some promised and his ideal urging him on, the good Dean at middle age took unto himself a wife and in 1728 set sail for the new world. He planned to establish his college in the Bermudas, at that time the most convenient central point from any British colony in America. But where did the Dean and his family go? To Rhode Island! To Rhode Island ostensibly to purchase land
in the Bermudas for his new college! Why I cannot tell you. (Were the eighteenth-century Bermuda land promoters pushing sales in New England?) And for three years Berkeley lived in Rhode Island, reading, studying, but apparently doing nothing to buy that land or to get his school started. Finally, convinced that Prime Minister Walpole never intended to give him the promised government support, and discouraged, he returned to Britain, where he published the fruits of his Rhode Island theological speculations, and then later in life took up the cause of the cathartic virtues of “tar-water.” But, upon his return he did divert some of the moneys for his college to Yale, where the Berkeley Scholarships still exist; and some books which he had collected did go to the Yale College library. His dreams became simply a “Bermuda College bubble.”

But the story does not end here. In 1873, when a name was being sought for the new town where the University of California was being established someone suggested that since Berkeley had said “westward the course of empire takes its way,” and since that westward course had finally reached the Golden Gate, and since Berkeley had dreamed of founding a college on that western course and a new university was now rising, the town should be called Berkeley (Berk-ley, of course), which it was.

There may be several morals in this story for university founders. One should not rely so completely on government promises. Dreams don’t always end as one thinks they will, but they do end eventually in some manner, so if one doesn’t carry through one’s plans someone else reaps the benefits. If one wants to get something started one cannot merely go and sit, waiting for the means to turn up; one has to go ahead before the means fully materialize. No university that ever got going had founders who did not push ahead.

C. E. G.

The importance of history is its relevance for the present. Now it may be, as editor Levine tells us in his interesting introduction to the book on Victorian consciousness, that the years from 1824 to 1837 in England have an importance for us today. They may help us understand our world by showing how the tradition of an industrial civilization developed. But a reproduction of some essays on the social problems of those pre-Victorian years lacks for us, who are not involved in their dated and dead issues, the drama that those writings had for a contemporary reader. Though some of the essays are by Carlyle, Mill, Hazlitt, Newman, Macaulay, the reader today does not feel the stimulus behind them. Resurrected journalism is not history.

True, the materials of history are the documents of the past. Our culture is so aware of this that we save practically every scrap of writing as if it had the importance of holy writ or the sacredness of a business contract. Recently we have even begun to do more. We produce book after book of minor scribblings as if they were significant documents worthy to be read by everyone. This is only the multiplication of archives of which there are mountains already. They are important to the historical scholar, of course, but need to be distilled through the process of historical writing.

I repeat, the importance of history is its relevance for the
present. That is why history needs forever to be rewritten. Like Gibbon, General Armstrong interprets this mission of history in a rigorous moral sense. The struggle between Rome and Carthage, he says, offers us lessons for today's struggle between the two great world powers.

The general is one of those humane gentlemen who have had the advantage of a traditional classical education. He supplemented a professional military career with a deep attachment to classical learning. As an interested amateur he has engaged in archeological diggings. He has continuously for over fifty years enjoyed his hour or two of daily reading from the literature of ancient Greece. His book is a joy for it reflects that rare quality of a cultured mind.

That the Carthaginian general, Hannibal, invaded and ravaged Italy for many years during the Second Punic War is common knowledge. But the final crushing of the African city by the Roman forces in the third war is a story untold for many years. This is the subject of the present book.

The Carthaginians, it seems, were a peaceful, commercially-minded people who, after lustily fighting Rome for sixty-three years in two wars, abandoned war as an instrument of national policy; while militaristic Rome, bent only on world conquest, weakened her rival through forty years of cold war. It used deception, blackmail, and subversion against its enemy. Realizing finally the Roman's true purpose, the Carthaginians declared war and for three years defended their city against overwhelming odds until it was finally destroyed after a bitter siege.

The parallel the general draws between the two powers warring then and the two powers at odds today is sometimes too adroitly made. By the end of the Second Punic War Carthage had been reduced to a mere city-state in size, while Rome was already extended by its possessions and allies throughout the Mediterranean. The Carthaginians were not so reluctant to fight (they never had been), as they were wise enough to know the odds against them. Furthermore, insufficient attention
is paid to other factors besides the military situation. Economically Carthage was already defeated when the third war began.

Historians today, except for Toynbee, who is more a metaphysician of history than an historian, usually stop short of pointing out any moral in their narrative. The vagaries of history caution them against such a practice.

Yet the book is absorbing in spite of or because of the moral, as you will. It is impossible to over-dramatize this interesting war story with the tragic finale. The author quotes frequently from Polybius’ account. I highly recommend also that one go to this Greek historian for a first-hand adventure in delightful classical reading.

History was the passion of the Romantics. They used it to justify their revolt against “eternal” rules in the arts. They revived, or at least tried to, the world of the past in imagination through the historical novel, in architecture with the Gothic revival. They expanded their metaphysical conceptions to substitute temporal process for eternal verities. And above all the Romantic sentimentalized; he was trapped by the love of love.

Such a Romantic was the young German, Heinrich Schliemann, who on listening to a recitation in Greek of Homer was caught by the powerful beauty of the language he did not understand. Subsequently he learned the language and the world of the Iliad became alive for him, its people real, its events actual, at a time when these were generally thought only fictive. So the passion of his life became fixed, to find the real Troy. With a singleness of purpose he worked to amass the necessary wealth; he educated himself in languages and scholarly learning. Finally, he even sought and found a nineteenth-century Helen, the young Greek schoolgirl who became his second wife and the companion of his archeological work. This double romance with Troy and with Sophia is the story the Pooles tell. Benefiting from the many letters and documents made available for the first time by the Schliemans’ grandson, they explain as has not been done before the motivations of this remarkable man. Though an amateur whose romantically
inspired hypotheses were contrary to much of the considered opinion of his time, and though his methods of working and his conclusions were sometimes too hasty and wrong, the impetus he gave Greek archeology is enormous. The professional archeologist today must criticize his methodology and manner of working; but this book is not a treatise on archeology, and those aspects are omitted, sometimes charitably to Schliemann’s advantage. By telling their story as the romance of two people the authors make one aware of the romance of archeology as it uncovers the rubble of the past and tries to piece it all together into a coherent pattern. They show us the debt archeology owes to the Romantic’s passion for the past and to his imagination.

No three books could be more different than these. Yet each of them is history; the first history as archive, the second history as drama, the third history as romance. History may be science, and history may be art. How much it should be all of these we would never dare say.

C. E. G.
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