

SKANOWAN

Vol. 2 No. 9

22 May 1964

HIROSHIMA SURVIVOR

WHERE HAVE ALL

May 22 at 1:25pm
Draper 349

THE FLOWERS GONE?

!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Hiroshima, city, SW Japan on Hiroshima Bay; pop. 285,812. A mfg. center, H was the target of the 1st A-Bomb dropped on a peopled area (Aug 6, 1945); some 150,000 person were killed or wounded; 75% of city destroyed or badly damaged. (The Basic Everday Encyclopedin, (New York 1954), p. 247.0)

It was a small bomb. As the Potsdam ultimatum sent to the Japanese on July 16, 1945, was "unworthy of public notice," so would that bomb be today; its destructive force was equal to only 20,000 tons of TNT. For some people, however, this baby bomb was big enough.

These people are the hibakusha - the ones who lived. The people who underwent Hiroshima and Nagasaki and survived, though wounded, scarred, or disabled. Their life has not been easy. A young girl, a baby at the time, had her arm and hand welded into a misshapen stick of bone and skin; at the age of twelve, she underwent four operations to restore her hand and wrist. And there is the young woman who, out of a class of one hundred and fifty, was one of less than fifty living after the bomb fell. Or then there was Sadako Sasaki, only two when the bomb fell. There is a legend in Japan that "he who folds a thousand cranes lives a long time." Sadako made 964 paper cranes. Then, at the age of twelve, she died in a hospital bed, a delayed victim of leukemia; a delayed statistic for the bomb.

Bertrand Russell has said, "The best authorities are unanimous in saying that war with hydrogen bombs is quite likely to put an end to the human race... there will be universal death - sudden only for a fortunate minority but for the majority a slow torture of disease & disintegration." Whether the future brings war or peace, these people already know the torture of disease. They carry the grief of the past and bear the social ostracism of the present. Few marry, for fear that genetic damage might bring deformed or sickly offspring; and those that do marry, marry other survivors, for those that did not endure the blast are afraid of the risks also and avoid them. Many are unemployable. For some, this is because their education was delayed and made impossible because of long illness. For a few, it is because the great torture and mental anguish has made them emotionally unstable.

A historic, world-wide mission is being undertaken by some of the survivors. They are coming to the United States with the support of such men as: Rod Serling, Bertrand Russell, Bishop James A. Pike, Norman Thomas, John D. Rockefeller IV, Albert Bigelow, and many others.

Miss Tazu Shibama, herself a member of the hibakusha, will address State students today, Friday May 22, at 1:25 pm in Draper 349. Miss Shibama is the General Secretary of the World Peace Study Mission. She is also the owner of the Hiroshima School of Typing and English, and she has been a past president of the Hiroshima YWCA.

Outside of the college buildings, after 12:00 noon, there will be a thirty foot trailer, complete with exhibits and displays, prepared locally and in Japan. State students who are unable to attend the discussion are cordially invited by Campus Christian Council to walk through it. The result of a nuclear holocaust can be a curious thing.

GM

MISSISSIPPI
FREEDOM SUMMER

!RALLY!

Sunday, May 24

5:00pm on

DORM FIELD-

A REVIEW OF ROLF HOCHHUTH'S THE DEPUTY

"What the world expects of Christians is that (they) should speak out loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnation in such a way that never a doubt . . . could rise in the heart of the simplest man . . . (Christians should be) resolved to speak out clearly and pay up personally."

From a statement by Albert Camus at the Dominican Monastery of Latour-Mauborg, 1948.

The Deputy has been styled "the most controversial play of our time." Be that as it may, it certainly has aroused a great storm of both criticism and praise. Upon entering the Brooks Atkinson Theater, a playgoer receives literature from the Knights of Columbus and B'nai B'rith attacking the historical value of the play (as well as a pamphlet proclaiming "Jesus Christ Saves"). Thus the evening begins in a most unusual fashion!

What about the play arouses people? The plot is fairly simple: the alleged failure of the Roman Catholic Church to condemn the wholesale slaughter of Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe. The leading character of the American production (which is greatly trimmed) is Father Riccardo Fontana, a Jesuit priest who serves in the diplomatic corps of the Vatican. As a witness to the atrocities against Jews in Germany, he returns to Rome to inform Pope Pius XII of the tragic situation. There he is frustrated by the "Cardinal," a prince of the Church whose ready wit and sense of Realpolitik have r placed him close to the Pope.

The Cardinal points out that the Church must remain aloof from temporal affairs. To speak out against Hitler would only bring a worse evil upon the Church. While he sympathizes with the plight of the Jews, he must recognize reality. Fontana is unmoved by these arguments and demands to see the Pope. Eventually his wish is granted. It is in the dialogue between the Pope and the priest that we see the true conflict. The Pope says, "Certainly the terror against the Jews is loathsome but we must not allow it to incense Us so that We forget the duties that devolve upon the Germans...as protectors of Rome."

In disgust, Father Fontana pins a yellow Star of David upon his cassock when he sees that Pius will not protest the persecution of the Roman Jews. He voluntarily chooses to join the Jews in their deportation to Auschwitz and share in their death.

The best performance of the evening was by Evelyn Williams as Pius XII. He played the role with the aloofness and fastidiousness proper to an other-worldly Pope. As Father Fontana, Jeremy Brett played his role as priest turned martyr in a most unconvincing fashion. Fred Stewart as the Cardinal handled his part with the vigor of a demonic Santa Claus. The portrayal of various German characters is a little too stereotyped, and they are reminiscent of the characters one sees in Grade-B World War II movies or the Late Late Show. Technically then, the play leaves much to be desired.

However, the play does present the dilemma confronting the Church at that time in a most plausible fashion. Hochhuth feels that although the Roman Catholic Church did help hundreds of Jews, still it committed the grave injustice of not speaking out against the slaughter. If the Pope's stand on the Jewish question was not bad, it wasn't particularly good, either. What the times needed was something more than just a mediocre response. The Deputy is not an anti-Catholic piece (indeed, its hero is a Catholic priest). What the author condemns is the attitude which kept Pius silent on the question of the extermination of the Jews, rather than the man himself.

The play ends as a challenge to all who care more for the institutions of the Christian church than for its dominant Spirit. By worrying about the physical well-being of the Church, they forget that God always remains in the Church. The moral to be drawn from this play is that Christians offend God by remaining tepid on the various moral questions of their time--be it the extermination of Jews or the persecution of Negroes. Thus, despite its many technical flaws, the play makes several important theological assertions.

In a sense this play is offensive to organized religion (of any brand) since it strips away all its pretension. However, it is more religious than most church services since it conveys several Christian concepts. (If one really wants to see something really odious [speaking as a Christian], all one has to do is visit the Billy Graham pavilion at the World's Fair and be "saved" by wide-screen, technicolored, stereophonic Christianity.)

The Deputy is not entertaining. If you want to be amused, see Hello, Dolly. It is not a family play (the World's Fair is for that). It even has some poor acting. However, it does force the person who sees it to think, which, in this day and age, is admirable.

Despite the uproar around its presentation, despite its many shortcomings, I recommend it for anyone who is concerned to take Christianity at all seriously.

(By Alan Minarcik, a former editor of Skandalon and a January, 1964 graduate of Albany State.)

(b) (Lidnos, samiro, et)

TO BREACH OR NOT TO BREACH: THAT IS NOT THE QUESTION

William V. Grimes, Department of Philosophy

Professor Standing, and others, have charged against my defense of the right to worship on a state university campus that what I propose would in effect be a "breach in the 'wall of separation'," a modification that would in fact become a dangerous precedent leading to more far-reaching modifications. If this is indeed the character of my proposal, then I stand ready to abandon it, for I share the feelings of those who have deep concerns about the dangers of any such breach.

However, I do not think that Mr. Standing has given a correct description of the position I am defending; I do not think he has considered adequately its nature or its implications. For this I must bear some measure of blame, for there are certain aspects of the position which I recognize I did not sufficiently develop. I hope the present comments will rectify that deficiency. If the position I support has the characteristics I believe it to have, then it constitutes, not a breach, but a bastion against breaches; the effects of acting on the proposal would be the exact opposite of what Professor Standing fears.

Please note that I did not defend the right to worship on a state university campus because I thought this a relatively harmless modification in the separation principle which would be helpful to religious groups. I defended it because it follows from what I believe is one of the safest, most just, precise, and clear interpretations of the principle of church-state separation that we could have: namely, that religious groups should have no more and no less rights and privileges than are allowed by law to any partisan groups.

My basic point is that state neutrality on matters of religion can best be maintained when that neutrality is clearly understood to be implemented by a legal criterion which is itself both unambiguous and easily recognized as fair and just. When an issue of religious right is at stake the question for the courts to ask is: Is this a right which any partisan group should have?

It would be an elementary logical confusion to protest that religious groups are not on par with other partisan groups in their emotive and evaluative significance. I am not claiming that they are. Obviously for large numbers of us they are not, and the briefest consideration of the history of church-state relations makes this abundantly clear. Religious and anti-religious beliefs are by their very nature concerns often felt with deep and fierce passion. It is for this very reason that the principle appealed to in adjudicating questions of religious rights and limitations needs to be trenchantly clear and rigorously fair. I think the one I am supporting qualifies on both counts.

Please note that this principle makes clear the viciously unneutral nature of the present "released time" law,* brings out the absurdity of the current agitation for a prayer amendment to the Constitution, and casts more than a pall of suspicion over any tax benefits that institutions enjoy purely because they have religious functions or affiliations.

Surely it will not be denied that the closer we can come to a clear and specific formulation of the law of separation of church and state the safer the legal law will be. The present state of legal and popular thinking on the subject seems to me to be dangerously confused. In the light of the many admirable stands the court has taken on maintaining church-state separation in recent years, how can we account for the lamentable lack of judgment and consistency reflected by the passage of such legislation as the "released time" law and the serious consideration now being given to the prayer amendment? And how can we account for the senseless deprivation of religious worship rights on state university campuses in New York State? To me all of these are signs of a serious case of "wobbles" in the body politic in regard to the separation principle. In legal and legislative thinking the determination to close off breaches in the principle gives way periodically to the feeling that perhaps the state is being too negative towards religion, and new breaches result from this mood. Then a compensating shift of mood brings legislation which is too negative. This vacillation stems, I believe, from the failure of responsible authorities and citizenry to have in mind a clear and precise concept of what state neutrality should mean. Clarification of the principle would, I believe, be an enormous stabilizing force.

* What other partisan groups could opt one hour, let alone forty hours, of in-school time per year?

The principle Professor Standing proposes suffers the grievous weaknesses of being unfair to religion and practically inapplicable if interpreted literally, and hopelessly vague if not so interpreted. He states ". . . the neutrality of the state is to be maintained, not by aiding all religions equally (an impossible task) but by withholding support to religion in any form." Surely it must be granted that the state now provides support to religious organizations in many forms, such as police protection, street maintenance in front of churches, state regulated (and sometimes subsidized) utilities, etc., and surely no sane person would want to deprive religious groups of such state aids. But, it may be objected, these aids are not provided to religious groups qua religious groups but to citizens participating in legal activities of their own choice. Exactly my point. Religion ought to receive all and only the state aid and rights that are available to any legal partisan group.

I think it would be only through the most adroit of muddled thinking that one could support the defense I made of the right to worship on a state university campus and reject these comments on the implications of that position.

My defense received a warm, even enthusiastic, reception from representatives of religious groups, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. I am especially gratified by this, for it is the religious groups who in the direct material sense would seem to have the most to lose (i.e., certain tax benefits) if my proposal became the basis of legal action.

However, the material loss would be many times compensated for, I believe, by the gain in spiritual integrity and protection of spiritual interests. As Professor Standing, and many others, have pointed out, the issue of preservation of separation of church and state is not one that should divide people into the camps of the religious vs. the non-religious, for the only logical division here is between those who value human freedom as a fundamental and sacred right and those who do not. One of religion's greatest enemies has been that vulgarization of the religious impulse exhibited whenever a group in the name of religion seeks to force its beliefs by political means on others. Despite the great gains that have been made, this moral and spiritual twistedness is still a fearsome force in the world today, and even in our own country. We don't have to go to Spain or to Israel to witness the tragic dementia of a religious group wielding its power to force its own beliefs and patterns of action on others, depriving them of their personal freedoms. In Connecticut a majority forces its will upon a minority by* clever lobbying succeeds in forcing its will upon the majority in the same kind of legislation. In the South religious power groups, claiming Biblical sanction; have been one of the potent forces in maintaining legislation which deprives the Negro of his human rights. Also in the South religious groups which only barely constitute a majority force their will in regard to liquor legislation on all the people. Our archaic divorce laws are another monument to fascistic tendencies among religious groups, i.e., the tendencies of a power group to force its will upon all peoples under its control without regard to the principle of maximizing human freedom. The greatest threats to our democracy are "majority vote fascism" and "lobby group fascism," and, sad and ironical as it is, we must face the fact that the spiritually perverted thinking of so-called religious groups remains one of the most potent threats to our religious and humanistic values.

Surely it is clear that I am not here attacking any sectarian groups as such, but only their common enemy: religious perversion. I presume that to all persons of spiritual depth and integrity--Protestant, Catholic, Jew, humanist--fascism, whatever its motives, must be looked upon with contempt and revulsion.

* please insert these words: "Enactment of birth control legislation; in Massachusetts a minority by".

(Editors note: If there is sufficient response to this article by any person or persons interested in replying to Mr. Grimes' argument, the editors of Skandalon will be pleased to publish an additional issue, carrying their reply.)

Skandalon is the biweekly journal of Campus Christian Council. Articles, poems, essays, drawings, or short stories are welcome. Anyone interested in submitting his or her work should contact Cliff Rugg via student mail or leave materials at 501 State Street.

Editors: Guy M. McBride
Clifford J. Rugg

We wish to extend our heartfelt thanks to all those people who have helped make this journal possible, both contributors and staff. We wish you a happy and profitable summer. Editor.