LONG AGO,
IN THE LATE ’50’s

From our present vantage point, the late fifties may look like a sea of tranquility. It is now easy to say that we were closing out the “flabby fifties,” the complacent Eisenhower era, the years of “the silent generation.” The very recollection must lead some people to send up, in the midst of the present frenzy, fervent prayers of hope for another “silent generation.”

At the time, however, the waters seemed stormy and rough enough. In its first issue, published January, 1958, worldview quoted Denis W. Brogan, a perceptive and sympathetic observer of American affairs. “For the first time in my thirty years study of the American way of life,” Professor Brogan wrote, “I am not convinced that it, at the moment, has what it takes to win this contest. I am convinced that it will prove not to have it if there is not a very fundamental stocktaking that will involve the abandoning of some very comforting illusions and, indeed, of some totally justified beliefs that were true only yesterday.”

And he went on to name some of the illusions: “The naive one that all technical progress is the work of Americans”; and “the respect given to the businessman as a representative figure who organizes the great human and physical resources of the United States to produce the American way of life.”

Considering only these two points, how have we done as we navigated the sixties? What are our national views on technical progress and on businessmen? It is difficult to bring into focus attitudes that are undergoing rapid change, but one can begin an assessment by saying exactly that — the attitudes are changing rapidly and differ significantly from those of the fifties. So far from thinking that all technical progress flows from the United States, Americans are now being taught to worry about the technical advances being made by other countries, and the possible military advantages that flow from them. Beyond that, however, there is among a small but growing community of sophisticated scholars and commentators an increasing concern over the effects of technology on man and his environment. In the minds of these people technological advancement is not automatically to be equated with human progress.

Some of the consequences of this change in attitude are evident in the attacks which are levied against those universities which have developed, through programs of research and development, close ties with the government and with the defense industry. This change in attitude is evident too in the uneasiness with which a number of students in the physical sciences anticipate the trajectory of their careers. On the single issue concerning technical progress one can
say that there has been change and that it has been significant. But one must also concede that the mass of the iceberg is still there. Representative L. Mendel Rivers spoke for many people when, in offering support for the A.B.M., he said that like every other American he wanted the latest that technology had to offer. As an administrator at M.I.T. put it, “Technology is America’s thing.”

And — the other point mentioned by Mr. Brogan — how fares the businessman today? At least among some groups in our society, the image of the businessman has fallen low indeed. It might be more accurate to say not that it has fallen as that it has been pulled down and kicked around. Like almost everything else in American life today, the image of the businessman has been altered by the war in Vietnam. Recruiters for some businesses have been routed from campuses; the officials of a number of companies, Dow Chemical for example, have become increasingly edgy and defensive about their defense-related contracts; stories about major inefficiencies and extremely high profits in the aerospace and electronics industries have become common enough to trouble many people, in and out of government.

It is exactly as a representative figure that the American businessman has been most strongly attacked. If he is the one who is primarily responsible for “the American way of life,” who — the rhetorical question follows — needs him? The charges against the businessman are often so crude and oversimplified as to engender sympathy. But the major point remains; the image of the businessman is changing.

It is probably too early to say whether the stocktaking implied in the changes is fundamental enough to alleviate Mr. Brogan’s earlier fears. But we will be able to say, looking back on the sixties, that it was in this decade that the task was at least begun.

J.F.

AND ON OTHER FRONTS

However impressive the change in attitudes about technology and the businessman, the rate of that change is glacial compared to the rate of change in religious attitudes. When worldview was initiated as a “Journal of Religion and International Affairs” a dozen years back, there was one response that quickly became, at least for the editor, a very weary cliche: “Religion and International Affairs?” (Said with uplifted quizzical eyebrows, a slight pause, then a faint smile to accompany the remainder of the question.) “Do they really have anything to do with each other?”

The question is still asked occasionally, but less superciliously. People who tended for years to dissociate morality and politics have been led or forced to discuss serious political actions within a framework of explicitly moral concern. Again, Vietnam was a major stimulus, but the issue once raised could not rest there. Not all of those concerned to provide an intellectually satisfying argument for their moral judgments were led to the major religious traditions of the West, but many were. And this search coincided with vast changes within the religious communities, changes which have led many of the most productive and reflective religious leaders not only to turn their attention outward, to the problems and the concerns of the world, but to regard their reflections on and their work in that world as specifically religious.

It is easy to find precedents for their attitude, but what needs to be stressed is what is innovative in recent religious thought. The point has been succinctly expressed by Gregory Baum in a recent issue of The Ecumenist. To quote him at some length:

“Divine revelation has to do with much more than with religion. It has to do with human life. The theologian reflecting on this divine Word is not restricted to religious or ecclesiastical concerns. He will have to deal with the ordinary issues of human life. He will be able to join the secular conversation going on in his own generation about man and society, and he will do this not in specifically religious terms or by offering a set of moral norms derived from religion, but in secular terms, in the terms of the conversation itself, because it is in this coming-to-be of the human world that God’s Word is present.”

“... The task of the theologian, understood in this perspective, is to detect how human life is threatened by destruction and to discern the powers of healing which, miraculously, are already at work among men.”

“... It may well happen that in a few years the bulk of theological literature will not deal with religious or ecclesiastical issues at all.”

Hopefully much of the theological literature will concern political action. The theologians need all the help they can get, but so do we all.