

In this stance the C.P. enjoys governmental support through which it can rid the political scene of the pro-Peking elements so that once again the Kremlin's monopoly might be established. In this endeavor the Party may also count, in the last analysis, on the Leftist press in general; while the revolutionary brochures will be placed on the shelves for the use of future historians the C.P. remains, in the eyes of the press, the main channel of the "revolution of our times."

The *second* conclusion is that May-June proved, certainly to the satisfaction of those who launched it, that sustained terroristic attacks on a crucial institution of an industrial society may throw that society into turmoil (even the soccer players and the hotel porters struck). Some may argue that a precondition to the spread of the movement is worker discontent, hence that similar things cannot happen in the United States and West Germany. I am not so sure; every society has its discontents, and the mass media are ready to spread slogans and calls to arms, to create tension, fear, and sufficient mass psychological unbalance to induce various strata of society into an avalanche-like movement. Whatever the chances for future use of the university as a subversive center (and I personally have no doubt that there are good chances), the student power in France can chalk up impressive gains: a 300 billion franc loss in production, millions of men-hours lost, the disastrous fall of the franc which is now refused as equivalent currency by France's Common Market partners or is exchanged at a 10-16 per cent discount. Needless to say, the Common Market also suffered a setback: France has requested a delay in letting steel and steel products (for example, cars) enter duty-free as they were supposed to as of July 1. Further results: a catastrophic tourist season, partial retreat of American investment, and a new, even more demagogic and impotent government, trusted by nobody. The ironic element is that de Gaulle's golden throne collapsed. He is now selling gold to Washington — in return for those despised dollars! The General now really only "survives himself," as his compatriots say.

Since from the point of view of student power the risks and the losses were minimal, and the gains spectacular, there is no reason not to repeat the performance elsewhere (in France too), this time with even better preparation and greater enthusiasm. True, France responded with an overwhelming endorsement of order and security. But this response could not have been registered without an obstinate old man first saying No. How many obstinate old men run today the affairs of Western democracies? In Italy, in Belgium, in Germany . . . and other countries?

# STUDENTS, FACULTY AND SOCIETY

William H. Cornog

*The following article is adapted from an address that Dr. Cornog recently presented to the faculty of the New Trier high schools, Winnetka, Illinois, of which he is Superintendent. Because it so clearly relates the life of the student to the large issues which now disturb our society, we judge it to be of particular significance at the beginning of this academic year.*

It seems to be that this year above all years we shall not want to or be able to confine ourselves to the examination of our instruction and guidance or purely the educational program. We are obliged to relate what we teach and how we teach, and the way in which we and our students live and study together, to the large and very serious concerns of our society in these most unquiet times.

Anyone who witnessed the recent events in Chicago must be more concerned than ever about the state of the union. Everyone who saw the violence in the streets and the incivility of the political scene indoors was shocked. But the tragedy is that few could have been surprised. The riots of Detroit, Newark, Cleveland, and Chicago of recent months and years, and the assassination of three of the most gifted and dedicated leaders of our time have well acquainted us with public murder and the thin line between law and licensed mayhem on both sides, between order and its mockery, a clubbed submission.

It will do us no good to commiserate with each other about these grosser symptoms of our society's sickness. The air can become polluted with self-righteous disavowals of our common guilt. Some demonstrators and a good many spectators doubtless believe that police actions prove how sick we are—sick and scared. Some who justify the police believe that the hippies and yippies are but micro-slices of the rotten core of our social decadence and moral decay. And of course to some the conduct of the convention itself calls into question the viability of the democratic political process.

The question before the house is, Are we having a breakdown of morals? The obsessive stress which our Puritan heritage has always caused us to place upon the relations of the sexes as the chief source of moral

conflict and the root of sin tells us that certainly we have had an increasing moral laxity. To many people the most conspicuous and to some people the only visible breakdown in morality is the change in sex mores and the well-advertised new freedom of the younger generation. Has there been a change of values? What are the young people talking about when they ask you to tell it like it is?

I think possibly a good many of the young have come to the troublesome conclusion that morality has a larger scope of concern than sex relationships. I think that they now not only expect it to be told like it is with honesty and candor and human understanding about sex and love, but they have some basic questions about honesty in all human relationships, about truth, about justice. I think that our young people are looking for some relevance between what their elders preach and what they see with their own unusually honest eyes.

The sins of our fathers, the small and large hypocrisies of a self-anointed and self-confessed affluent and free society, have haunted us all our lives. With respect to the black man, the white man has lived a life of total illusion or willful or witless self-delusion. With respect to the poor, the affluent everywhere have put such distance between themselves and the windward side of squalor that only an occasional whiff of poverty assaults a remote nose.

•

What does all this imply for education, and especially for our own communities? Quite clearly, we live in a society which suffers from a chronic and highly communicable malady, which is not unique to our time or to our nation, and that is phoniness or false values, or in the old phrase—false gods. Clearly also, we live in a society which communicates constantly, but also trivially and often dishonestly or hypocritically, or incredibly. I find it increasingly difficult to maintain a proper grown-up patronizing tolerance of the younger generation's impatience. And I don't mean the hippies or the unwashed minority who are copping out, and doing it just as successfully and selfishly as the well-scrubbed squares who have taken seats high up and far back, above the arena, from which vantage point they often vaguely identify with the lions.

I think we in the schools owe it to our youth—and we have always owed it—to join them in honest and open-minded inquiry, to try to understand their concerns, to help them to find honest and relevant answers. Above all, to listen to them. A great majority of them have their faces turned toward reality, which is always hard to do in youth because it ages you.

But in the face of war, poverty, and mindless injustice, you grow up fast, and sometimes in Vietnamese villages and American ghettos you die young.

In the presence of such realities, to help our students find honest and relevant answers, must we make our curriculum and teaching problem-centered and present-oriented? I don't think so. I don't think that there is any necessary or logical conjunction between the contemporaneous and the relevant. The insights and intuitions of literature and philosophy, religion, and art have in my own experience been a good deal more relevant to our times and the men we are than a hundred sociological investigations and hypotheses.

On the other hand of course it is possible to take refuge totally in the scholar's study and spend one's intellectual life in suspended judgment, in a kind of introverted anarchism. *Non sine pulvere*, shouted that great poet, intellectual-activist John Milton. Not without dust, not without sweat. In semi-pedagogy, we have an obligation in the affective domain and in the search for values as heavy as our obligation in the cognitive. Knowledge without the commitment of its use in virtuous action is sterile and ornamental, and often dangerous. It is not enough to know the Bill of Rights, to assent to it with the mind, if there is dissent in the heart. It is not enough to know one's fellow man, to appreciate him, to understand him, or even to cherish him as a fellow-citizen of a democracy. The commandment is to love him as thyself.

The hippies use the word love in what seems to some a loose way, even a vulgar way. To some, the use seems somewhat old-fashioned and religious. In a society increasingly dehumanized by materialism, automation, mass media and mass everything, it is not enough to call for the preservation of individual dignity and the continued celebration of the worth and sanctity of the person. What we have to save together is our common humanity, and this we can only do by love.

I think that we who are the transmitters of not only our own but the world's culture are not only remiss but betray our profession if we do not cause to be examined and if justified, celebrated, some of the old truths which remain part of the wisdom of the race. We, the human race, do bear the mark of Cain. We have been, and still are, notable brother-murderers. We know that our redemption is through love. Shall we bow to vulgar and cynical times and deny that we are our brother's keeper? Shall we join the rout of integrity and patronize fraud? Is kindness corny, and civility of no consequence?

Few Christians, and few of any sect I suppose, possibly can rise to the level of that God-like love of fellow man which goes beyond understanding, but

the open mind and heart, the civil and courteous response to a brother's eye and hand—these are surely not just old-fashioned and passé gestures. I have a concern for the state of the union. I have a concern for the hatreds we harbor and the love we cannot summon. I have less concern for civil disobedience than I have for uncivil and obedient disengagement and non-involvement. I think that apathy and neglect are possibly as inhuman as brutal repression and much more enduring in their consequences. We shall not cure the sickness of this great society this academic year. But so far as the sickness is in us as

teachers and in our young students, we have the duty to seek remediation and attempt to regain health.

This will be a year of self-study, of inquiry into our professional competencies, of search for improvement of instruction and of all that we do here. The times demand more than that of us; our students deserve and will demand more than that of us. We are as a faculty professional enough, honest enough, human enough, and yes, young enough to want to tell it like it is and to do it.

Good luck, and if the Supreme Court doesn't mind, or any of you, God bless you.

## HUMAN RIGHTS: THE CHURCH SPEAKING TO POLITICS, II

Quentin L. Quade

To look at some of the most prominent conditions of contemporary politics, is in fact to identify the circumstances within which the Churches must work in trying to promote human rights. Human rights may be *identified* abstractly, but they do not *exist* abstractly. They exist, where they exist at all, within political confines; and these same confines suggest what the proper role of the Churches may be. If this seems a harshly limited basis for defining the Churches' role, it is not because this writer seeks to limit, but rather because the limitations are genuinely there, and the Churches are unlikely to do effectively even their limited task unless they concentrate their energies on these channels.

The modern nation-state, and the preponderantly secular society over which it presides, do not feel obligated to seek out the Church as teacher, let alone definer of their actions. As was noted earlier, this nation-state is "free," in the sense that it has few fore-ordained directions it feels bound to follow. But precisely because it is free in this sense and thus quite perpetually engaged in defining and redefining its directions, it is open to teaching — *open* to counsel

as to what its objectives are to be. This, it would seem, provides the primary opportunity which the Churches have to impact upon the political order and the decisions about human life that order consistently makes. Particularly, this suggests two primary and related avenues of religious involvement in political matters.

First, and very generally, the Church relates to politics as one of the primary shapers of the social ethos. This refers to the "givens" and general patterns within society, the premises which tend to give a society its distinctiveness. These values in turn are likely to be given concrete form in the policies of that country. It may be that the explicit religious roots of such values have been forgotten or so interwoven with historical development as to be practically indistinguishable. But if one asks, for example, why the United States is as it is, where her characteristics come from, it seems not possible to offer an explanation without heavily accenting the religious component. In this very fundamental sense, religion has helped (in Paul Ramsey's terms) provide *directions* but not *directives* to political society.

But the second avenue of religious influence is far more crucial for the purposes of current and future politics. It has two elements: the capacity of the Church to mold the individual's value structure; and the capacity of the individual to help determine the policies of his nation. Is there, can there be, a distinctive Christian ethic? The answer, it would seem, must be a carefully qualified affirmative. There is no claim

---

Quentin Quade, a frequent contributor, is a political scientist on the faculty of Marquette University. This, the conclusion of a two-part article, is adapted from an essay that will appear in *The Human Right to Be Educated*, scheduled for publication by Corpus Instrumentorum.