

# SKANDALON

Vol. 1, No. 14

May 29, 1963

Being the editor of a journal has its manifold frustrations and satisfactions. Our statement of purpose in the first issue was to "attempt to speak to the university community, correlating the Christian faith and contemporary life." Those first few issues were always missing their dateline and in a few instances conspicuously lacking in material. Due to the thought and concern of our contributors, the fearlessness of our proofreader, the patience of our typist, and the indulgence of the Campus Minister in providing materials for us, we have been able to make Skandalon into a continuous, bi-weekly journal.

Skandalon's raison d'etre has not only been to provide more literature for campus edification. Skandalon arises from a notion of Christianity which transcends what is commonly labelled "religion." Religion (i.e., Christianity) is much more than a Sunday morning worship experience. It finds its roots in all facets of our lives. Thus the Christian has a concern for everything around him. The commitment of faith has as its concomitant a concern for the entire world.

As Christians, we have concerns for the various social problems around us. During the year, Skandalon's primary concerns have tended to be with these problems. However, our concerns lie also in the realms of theology and the fine arts. It is hoped that these concerns will play a more prominent role in next year's Skandalon. "Skandalon" in Greek means "stumbling block or that which offers offense." So it is with a journal which attempts to relate itself to issues of concern. It cannot but cause offense if it challenges the hypocrisy of a community (i.e., the university community) which too often holds itself aloof from the community in which it finds itself. The Christian cannot be but a spectator, he must be a participant. If he criticises, he does it in love. If he challenges, he is willing to risk being challenged. When one witnesses to God's love, one takes sides once and for all.

Skandalon has tried to witness by giving an opportunity for the presentation of various concerns. We have tried to avoid self-righteousness. We have also tried to avoid making judgements from the "Ivory Tower." We at all times have been mindful of the responsibility of being part of the campus ministry and have attempted to act in humility. As soon as we play the hero or attempt to be "nay-sayers," Skandalon will not be acting out of love and hence will be subverting its own purpose. Skandalon challenges all not "to be conformed to this world...but to be transformed by renewal of spirit." As long as we can examine our concerns sub specie crucis and to do so with some grace, we shall be accomplishing our purpose.

Editor  
Alan Minarcik

---

## CHEESE IT, THE LAWYERS

There have been further developments in the case of Russell Broughton, prominent church and civic leader arrested for interfering with another's arrest when he questioned Albany policeman John Cody's "manhandling," to use Mr. Broughton's term, of prisoner William Washington. The grand jury investigation of the matter has been concluded with no action being taken. Police Commissioner James Kirwin has convened a public hearing, now recessed.

This open hearing, convened on May 9, exactly one month after Mr. Broughton's arrest, is disturbing for two reasons. The first is the manner in which witnesses at the hearing were questioned. Despite frequent affirmations by all parties involved, the questioning did not seem to be aimed at learning the truth of the matter. It seemed, rather, to be aimed at intimidating the witnesses. Thus, in every instance in which the testimony of Mr. Broughton and police officers conflicted (there were many), Mr. Broughton was asked to characterize the officers as liars. Further, he was asked to verify not whether newspaper accounts of his and Mr. Washington's arrests were correct but whether they quoted him correctly. Police officers were asked to state that to stand and watch an arrest is to commit a crime. (One of them did.) In other words, no one took seriously the real task of



the hearing, to determine if Mr. Broughton did interfere with an arrest and if officer Cody did strike Mr. Washington.

Secondly, the hearing has been recessed with no indication that it will be reconvened. Yet, William Washington, who probably knows as much about the alleged manhandling as anyone, has not been heard. Again, there seems to be little real concern to determine what actually happened.

Civil rights of every citizen, white or black, churchman or atheist, policeman or telephone company executive, must be protected in Albany as in Alabama. When, as in the Broughton affair, there is any indication that these rights are abused, every effort must be made to determine the truth of the matter and to prevent further abuse. This is fundamental to both a democratic and a Christian society. The most shocking aspect of this case is not Mr. Broughton's arrest, is not the manhandling of Mr. Washington, but is the apparent lack of honest concern on the part of city officials.

Tom Bartlow

---

#### THE BUNNY'S PHILOSOPHY

In the May, 1963 issue of Motive, an article appeared that commented rather acerbically on the rambling Bunny philosophy espoused by Mr. Hefner, Editor of Playboy magazine. William Hamilton concluded his essay by stating, "You can't help but like the guy (Hefner). Here, if you will, is a man really come of age. How do you tell a Hefner that Jesus Christ is his Lord?"

Hamilton, however, is not lauding the man; rather, he is lamenting the times. "The Playboy Philosophy," contrary to one's expectations, is not joyful, superficial, or even particularly optimistic. Rather, Hefner has devised a modus vivendi that is serious, weighty, and cumbersome. What is more amazing, he speaks not only for himself, but, in addition, for the large group of males in the community that, seemingly without any particular relish, buy his magazines and attend his clubs.

Basically, Hefner is for "God, America, individualism, capitalism, pretty girls, and living life with immense gusto and relish." He is opposed to "Puritanism, bad religion (usually of the organized type), censorship, the extremes of left and right, conformity, and prohibition." Such originality is not exactly astounding, although Hefner's apparent sense of originality is. Hefner does, at one point at least, agree with the Bible: Both affirm the goodness of the body. One could wish for more, but apparently Hefner misses that which every college student is (sometimes painfully) aware of: "The power and mystery of sexuality."

Nevertheless, Hefner plods on, undaunted in his championship of Mother and country and his crusade against sin. For example, he poses democracy and its ideals against those of Christianity. (i.e., the Doctrine of Original Sin as opposed to the "innocent til proven guilty" precept.) Of course, the doctrines of self-interest and hard work were originally developed in Protestant theology by Calvin, as evidence of being one of the "Elect." The Puritans made good use of these religious ideas to carve out "New Frontiers," but Hefner probably means he's against Pietism, rather than Puritanism in this respect. Also, our Founding Fathers, whether Christian or otherwise, believed in the perceptiveness in analyzing their peers, or as the result of rather deep introspection, the Founding Fathers also recognized the capabilities of man for evil, and they made suitable provisions for such in the "separation of powers." Despite this, one must admire Hefner for his staunch uncompromising stand on this issue.

Not many men would have the courage to honestly and publicly (although there may be some grounds for believing some do it privately) choose the "Knife your Buddy" credo over the "Love thy Neighbor" clause in the Christ-God contract for salvation.

Guy M. McBride

---

#### Staff:

Editor.....Alan Minarcik  
Associate Editor...Guy McBride  
Typist.....Peggy Holt  
Staplers.....Cliff Rugg  
                  Dave Simington

\*\*\*\*\*  
The last chapel service of the academic year will be held at the Unitarian Church of Albany on Wednesday, May 29, at 12:00 noon.

The fifth annual Protestant Baccalaureate Service will be held immediately prior to the commencement exercises on Sunday, June 16 at 8:00 a.m. It will be held at the First Lutheran Church on Western Ave. The Rev. Eugene Monich will lead the worship. The Rev. Frank Snow, Campus Minister, Dr. Catherine Newbold and Dr. Clifton Thorne will also participate. Coordinator of the service will be Mr. Karl Peterson. Music will be directed by Mr. Jan Dykman. A coffee hour will precede the service.



(Editor's note: At our request, Dr. Colby, of the English Department and Mr. Grimes, of the Philosophy Department, have consented to write on: Is the historicity of the Christ event the necessary center of Christian Faith?)

Dr. Frances L. Colby

The editor of Skandalon has asked me to write concerning "the relevance of the Christ-event," supposing quite correctly that I should take the affirmative position, thus balancing another article he had solicited. It, I infer, maintains that some sort of "Christian value" or "meaning" or "principle" can stand apart from the identity and the activity of Jesus, who is called Christ. I mention this context only to say that I have not seen the article and that, therefore, my touching or failing to touch any point in it is purely coincidental.

First I need to define what I mean by "Christ-event" as an occurrence in time, subject to historical record. Hence, challenging the historicity of an event means primarily questioning whether it ever really happened at all; or, conceding that "something happened," one may question the accuracy of the records or the interpretations given them. That there really was a man called Jesus, few will dispute. The records concerning him have been challenged from several quarters, most significantly because of what historic Christian affirmations claim to find asserted in them concerning his identity. In other words, what really happened depends altogether upon who was acting and suffering. Here the term "Christ-event" becomes a paradox: the temporal, humanly verifiable event; and the affirmation "Thou art the Christ," with its momentous acknowledgement of a transfinite and unique significance in his presence on earth. This affirmation, whenever and wherever made, is apostolate not subject to the historian's modes of verification; it is an act of faith. One will hardly take such a step without perusing the records and noting others' responses to them, but perusal does not necessitate assent. The page, which in fact records that he whom it attests refused to give a sign, plays no supernatural tricks before the reader's eye; the documents are natural facts whose provenience we largely know. They do not and cannot "prove" a supernatural fact, but they proclaim one and thus do necessitate response. Affirmation, denial, and indifference are all responses.

Affirming the "Christ-event" means seeing the world one inhabits as a place explicitly and temporally entered by God; it means seeing history as the record of species whose doings and sufferings God has concretely shared; it means seeing oneself and all men as creatures whose alienation God endured a tortured human death to heal and whose reconciliation His resurrection makes sure. To affirm this is, I repeat, an act of faith. And while faith may and must quaerere intellectum, such intellectualizing, however brilliant, mistakes itself if it claims to "prove" faith. For faith here means not dogma but commitment, whose testing ground is no smaller than the whole world that impinges on a man, and the duration of the experiment no shorter than his life and his dying. Relevance becomes indeed the only relevant question.

On any of many motives one may dismiss Christ-event as a priori impossibility or Christian commitment as pragmatic irrelevancy. A prioris are not arguable, and with him who holds them the issue must be dropped. It must be honestly joined with him who says, "I believe in the teachings but not the person," or "I believe God was in Christ only as God was in all men," or "The ethic of love--yes; incarnation--no." Must one indeed go farther? How essential is the difference between the positions just indicated and the unreserved credo? Two things I think one must indeed do: think strenuously and speak honestly; and resign to a wiser Judge the ultimate writing or striking of the title Christian by any man's name. In this spirit I have to answer, I find the difference absolutely essential. Why? To answer means to bear witness, even at the risk, in brief space, of sounding naive and dogmatic.

Briefly then, I do not need one more teacher, exemplar, hero among the select company that history and contemporary life exhibit. A man who lived and died 2000 years ago has no more to offer me than Socrates, Ghandi, or Dr. Thomas Dooley, I find many such inspiring; I recognize them all for men, mortal and fallible. But if I imbibe the teachings and try to emulate the conduct of any what promptly enough dismays me is not his limitation but my own. I can follow dialectic with mental zest; I can pay homage to what is admirable; I can have the impulse, and therefore, I suppose, some capacity, to perform it. But--a paradox--I cannot be as good as (I tell myself) I can be. I cannot ever long sustain, often not even determine, good (no question of "best") behavior. I am divided as I probe my motives, baffled by lack of insight, defeated by my own failure. And this, popular psychiatry assures me, is the standard human condition. Such assurance is the most discouraging of opiates, next to the remedy of giving up and settling for myself as I am. And not one of the teachers, exemplars, heroes who exhort, beckon, and inspire can make me acceptable to myself, let alone enable me to be good. My supposing them to be patient, humane, and charitable, even as my friends and family are, certainly helps me no more than this nearer and warmer support. The theological name for the thoroughly existential helplessness I am talking about is sin. And the case is



hopeless unless someone as utterly vulnerable to it as I am and yet utterly free and clear of it can set me free by accepting me precisely as I am. Only through accepting such acceptance can I accept myself and become free to grow whole and thus grow into goodness--that is, into love which accepts all others because they also have been accepted, whether they acknowledge it or not. And this break-through, the doing for me what no man can do, is what the Christ-event proclaims to me has happened--really, historically, improbably, stunningly happened. God, who understands the atom and the Milky way, fully knows me and knows how it feels to be what I am because of the appalling thing He did--entering the deepest abysses my nature is capable of and going the whole way through death, over which He had power, in order to offer me His resources for my living and my dying. This is acceptance; its other name is love. And I am free to say yes, or no, or to ignore it.

The mind that does not boggle at this is not working; and to proffer pat analogies for what by definition is unique only risks sentimentality. For what God, according to the Good News, has done there is no analogue. But for my assenting to it there are at least partial ones. Any human being who exchanges forgiveness with a brother, for love's sake forbears an advantage, stints himself for his child, dies for his friend, does that for which he can give no reason he does not ultimately know to be a rationalization. The mind boggles, but the ultimate self is constrained and acts. The act is one of faith, and only the actor can say "It failed" or "It worked." So with the Christ event: that I cannot comprehend (explain, analogize, patronize) it is not only immaterial, it in fact "figures." How could I possibly? It is not the only thing but it is momentarily the greatest one which, not comprehending, I accept. The fantastic, the scandalous proclamation confronts me. I must dare to say either yes or no to it. I do not need to shout--the merest stricken whisper is valid. Only I may not say "Yes, but..."; and I must allow that my brother whose lips I hear saying "No, but..." may with his life be sounding in the nicer ear of God a more finely tuned yes than mine.

I am well aware that all of this invites the reply: "You are simply saying that you need this doctrine and therefore choose to believe it--that doesn't make it true." I revert to my earlier comment: relevance, not truth, was the issue proposed to me. Nor is this to plead expediency. Operation bootstrap ("positive thinking") is just what I want none of--implicit in the Christ affirmation is that I do in fact believe it to be true. Appealing this affirmation to history would arrive at exactly the same point as appealing it to personal experience--I might be reading my own value judgments into history, or apostles, saints, and martyrs, might be victims of delusion and euphoria as readily as I. The evidence of history will not be closed until the end of time, or of the human race, just as the evidence of individual experience is not complete this side of death. The truth of that which faith affirms is simply not susceptible to proof by statistics or theorem, still less to demonstration by controlled experiment. But the relevance of that which faith affirms can be attested by anyone who has found it the hinge upon which turns the possibility of life as against existence. Exactly and only this testimony can I offer.

---

William Van Grimes

He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

"John 3:18"

We think of the faith of the Christian as founded on "belief in Jesus." What does this mean? What is the essential nature of the faith which we take to be interpreted by this phrase?

#### HISTORIC FAITH

(1) In an obvious sense "to believe in Jesus" means to believe that certain events occurred in Palestine about 2000 years ago, the belief centering around the conviction that Jesus existed as a unique incarnation of the divine in the human, and that through his dying on a cross redemption from sin and salvation to eternal life became available to mankind in a new way. Many could add: from that time forth, at least, this was the only way.

#### LEGALISTIC FAITH

(2) Another kind of belief appears often to be added to #(1) as an integral part of the meaning of "believing in Jesus": this is the belief that one must believe in the occurrence of the historical-metaphysical events referred to under #(1) in order to be saved. The assumption here is that belief that these events occurred constitutes at least part of the necessary condition for achieving salvation.

#### REBIRTH FAITH

(3) A more general significance is commonly recognized as forming a basic part of the religious meaning of the act of faith: that to "believe in Jesus" is to live in the awareness that in his life and death the relationship of the divine to the human is symbolized with unique efficacy. We feel that Jesus' life, or the concept of it, provides



the paradigm stretch of history in terms of which the essential nature of the divine-human encounter is revealed to man, i.e. that God is Being of redeeming love who both transcends the world and is a presence with man and in man in the world: that divine being can become the very substance and power and intentionality of man's spiritual being, which is his essential nature. That only through rebirth in divine love can man attain adequate meaningfulness (sense of purposeful existence) in his life, adequate love (satisfying "I-Thou" relatedness to others), and adequate courage and perspective to overcome the suffering and tragedy that are an inescapable part of human existence. He who does not live out of divine love as the center of his own being condemns himself to the frustration of his own spiritual yearnings and to their eventual eternal death.

I think all the Gospels and the writings of Paul clearly present Rebirth Faith as the substance of the primal act of Christian faith: the essence of what it means "to believe in Jesus". Paul and parts of the Gospel of John seem to teach that as a consequence of this act there will come by grace an awareness of the truth of #(1), i.e. Historic Faith. Of course, as Paul notes, Historic Faith is absurd when judged by the powers of man's reason alone. This truth can only be revealed to man through grace, and as so revealed it does not stand against reason. Consequently, it is absurd to think of the act of believing in the historic Jesus as constitution the basic act of faith, or even part of it, with the awareness and rebirth described under Rebirth Faith conceived of as a reward given on the condition of believing in the historic Jesus. There is no good religious motive to believe this except as a consequence of a revelation given by grace, which itself would seem to presuppose Rebirth Faith. This is not to deny that both the historic and rebirth Faiths might both occur in the same religious experience, but it is to note that only the latter could be the primal act of faith required of man.

Legalistic Faith would seem not only illogical and unscriptural, but a very tragically twisted vulgarization of the message of Jesus (and Paul and John). It turns the requirement of faith, the condition for man receiving salvation, into the very kind of thing Jesus most deeply and pointedly opposed: salvation as achieved through fulfilling a legalistic requirement. To act out of love is the one requirement; all else that is required must follow from this; this is the required "purification of the heart" that man must initiate, though he cannot accomplish this apart from unity with the power and depth of divine love. Since man cannot will that something be revealed to him (he can only will to try to change his motives of action, his "heart"), how can he, with good motive, will that which his natural powers of reason condemn as absurd--unless it be first revealed to him? To claim to make the historic act of faith purely out of fear or love of God would be hypocrisy: lying to God and to oneself.

But this does not yet point to the basic religious and moral twistedness of the Legalistic Faith position. The root problem is not that man is called upon to believe without grounds what outrages his reason, but that he is presented with a demand for belief which radically violates his deepest moral consciousness. He is called upon to believe that the God of love would impose on him as a condition for sharing in divine love that he believe certain super-natural facts about how that divine love has come into the world in time. Granting that they are facts does not alter one whit the immorality of the demand. Why should one individual be brought into divine love because he fulfills an arbitrary legalistic requirement for correct belief, often arrived at as effortless fulfillment of social conditioning and expectation, while another is cut off from that love because he never knew the requirement, or because, out of his sense of integrity, his feeling that his moral consciousness is one of his most precious gifts from God (that in him which probably most purely reflects the image of God), he refuses to believe that a God of love would impose upon him as a condition for his being accepted into divine love a demand which comes to his own deepest moral consciousness as a gruesome outrage to the law of love?

Is it possible to conceive a more radical betrayal of the message of Jesus than this? What irony that to the question "what does the God of love demand of me?" there should be those (are they legion?) who accept an answer which if honestly faced would include the confession: "That I stand in the awareness that the deepest part of my spiritual being must judge him to be a moral pervert." What higher blasphemy?

What about those individuals who experience a deep conviction of Rebirth Faith not of Historic Faith? I would say they have that aspect of faith which Jesus taught and was concerned be spread from heart to heart (cf. Mark, Matthew, Luke), though they do not exhibit all the marks of the believer according to the criteria of Paul, some parts of the Gospel of John, and later orthodox Christendom. Are such believers Christians? Perhaps not, for Rebirth Faith by itself allows one to hold that belief in the historical Jesus is not necessary to spiritual unity with God. Not even employment of specifically Christian symbolism is necessary. However, to conclude that such persons are not Christians is not, I suspect, to make a value judgment of any great religious import, but only to make an observation on the proper use of verbal labels as



determined by ordinary linguistic usage - a question of interest to sociologists of language and those with certain anxieties about the criteria of inclusion and exclusion in regard to membership in the coveted "in" groups of their social milieu.

It has been my own observation that some who have not found the question of the literal truth status of the historic Faith of crucial religious significance have shown in their own lives profound evidence of having experienced a vital encounter with the Christ of the Gospels.

"Even the Holy One of the Gospel must be compared with our ideal of moral perfection before He is recognized as such."

--Immanuel Kant.

---

One of the joys of group life on this campus is the making of a constitution. The following is a copy of it. After much diligent work, we have come up with a document that has made everyone happy. Special thanks are owed to the Constitutional Committee of Senate for suggesting a format and pointing out numerous errors in it. Every organization must have a constitution and now we have one. Now we can hold our heads high.

--Constitutional Committee of the Campus Christian Council

Campus Christian Council  
Constitution

Article I Name

This organization shall be known as the Campus Christian Council of the State University of New York at Albany.

Article II Purpose

The Council exists to relate the Christian faith to the life of the academic community by providing students and faculty with opportunities for study, worship, and action within an ecumenical Christian perspective.

Article III Membership

Section 1. Council Members

- A. The Council shall consist of not less than six students and not more than three faculty members.
- B. Any student or faculty member who has participated in activities sponsored by the Council during one preceding semester and who is in agreement with the aforesaid purpose of the Council shall be eligible for election to the Council.
- C. New members of the Council shall be elected by a two-thirds affirmative vote of said Council.
- D. Council members may be dismissed by a three-fourths vote of the Council.

Section 2. Associate Member of the Council

The Campus Minister of the Capital Area Council of Churches shall be an associate member of the Campus Christian Council.

Section 3. All members of the academic community are invited to participate in those activities sponsored by the Council.

Article IV Officers

Section 1. At the last meeting of each month, the Council shall appoint by a simple majority vote one of its members to the post of Council Chairman.

Section 2. The Council Chairman shall:

- a. Preside at all Council meetings during the month following his election.
- b. Prepare the agenda for each meeting, subject to the approval of the Council at said meeting.
- c. In the absence of the chairman, the chairman of the preceding month shall preside over the meeting.

Article V Meetings

Section 1. The Council shall meet at least once each month during the school year.

Section 2. The Chairman shall call special meetings at his own discretion or at the request of two-thirds of the Council members.

(to be continued)



## PACEM IN TERRIS AND GOOD WILL TO MEN--ALL MEN

The recent Papal Encyclical "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth) has evoked much comment from many parts of the globe. Statesmen and churchmen from every major country in the world have praised this document as a sincere step toward the age honored ideal of "Peace on Earth." There is little doubt in most critics' mind that the Pope has found the best possible formula for this end.

At first one experiences a deep joy at the almost universal agreement and praise which the world has given the encyclical. Pope John's great testimony to the human spirit has succeeded in accomplishing for at least a few moments what most men wish could become an enduring fact--a drawing of the human family into its intended state of harmony. Moscow's Izvestia and the U. S. State Department were equally warm in their comments. Time magazine reported that an American diplomat in Rome exulted: "It embodies everything the U. S. has been working for. We couldn't agree with it more." U. N. Secretary General U. Thant seems to have spoken for everyone when he paid tribute to the Pope for "his great wisdom and courage."

There have also been comments on the document that have attacked the thought of what the statesmen of East and West commonly call "peaceful co-existence." A Rome daily newspaper, Il Tempo, spoke peevishly of the Popes paper as an encyclical of enthusiasm conceived under the sign of optimism and irenicism, "the work of a dreamer. This comment was answered the same day in the internationally respected Le Monde of Paris by an editorial describing the Popes release as "realistic, serene and confident of the future." In a similar vein, the President of the American Jewish committee, A. M. Sonnabend, declared that "the encyclical creates a broad dimension of possible cooperation among diverse religious, ethnic and racial communities."

On April 22 of this year in the halls of our own Congress in Washington the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, Democratic Congressman from Illinois, heralded the Papal decree as "a document which men of all faiths and all political philosophies can use as a basis toward seeking a new solution to the problems which beset our mid-20th century world." On the same day the complete text of "Pacem in Terris" was printed in the Congressional Record, one of the greatest tributes our government can give any document.

No reactions won more attention, however, than those in the Communist press on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Moscow's Pravda professed to view "Pacem in Terris" as "an initiative in favor of peace." Radio Budapest spoke of "a new wind blowing from the Vatican."

Indeed, the secretary of the American Communists, Gus Hall, intimated that party members themselves may have to readjust their overall estimate of the Roman Catholic Church as a social institution."

What did these straws in the Communist wind add up to? Surely nothing in the curiously muted statements issuing from any communist source even hints at compromise or co-existence, on the ideological plane, with the West--let alone with Christianity. More importantly, of course, even the most casual reader of the encyclical must realize that the Church has no intention of compromising its doctrine based on the teachings of the gospel. It can never remain true to its divinely instituted nature and at the same time renounce its vision of human dignity and the consequent necessity of grounding true peace in respect for the inalienable rights of men. Thus, for the Church, any genuine co-existence supposes respect for such rights, including true religious freedom.

An adequate interpretation of the encyclical "Pacem in Terris" must wait on lengthy study, because the space reach of the Popes' words, in its breadth and depth, is greatly extensive. It is obvious that Pope John offers a shining example of everything that he means by his own word, "aggiornamento." He situates himself squarely in the year 1963. There is not the slightest note of nostalgia, nor of lament, over the past course of history or over the current situation. The Pope confronts all the facts of political, social, economic and cultural change that have been the product of the modern era. Generously and ungrudgingly, he accepts those elements of historical progress.

The basic principle of the Roman Pontiff is as old as Plato, for whom society was "man writ large." The "man" whom the Pope puts at the basis and center of a human world order is not the abstract human nature which is presented in certain older textbooks on ethics. His "man" is the man of today, the human person upon whose structured nature history too has left its mark. This strongly personalist accent of the Pope should quiet the fears and win the sympathies of those to whom the phrase "natural law" is uncongenial.

"Pacem in Terris" must be seen as far more than an idle or merely sentimental gesture toward peace. Whatever the motivation behind his remark, Premier Khrushchev spoke the truth when he remarked to an Italian journalist that the encyclical genuinely sought peace, which



"can and must be defended by men of good will of every philosophical and religious conviction." Such peace, Pope John would add, can survive only in an order rooted in "truth, justice, charity and freedom."

As Le Monde rightly notes, "there can be no mistaking that the encyclical's closely written lines trace out new approaches heavy with meaning for the future."

Sheila O'Connell

and

Edward D. Sanford

---

#### A SURE CURE FOR THE SUMMERTIME BLUES

This summer the Northern Student Movement, an organization dedicated to helping Negroes in the North, is sponsoring a tutorial project in the South End of Albany. As you probably know, Albany, New York is not very dissimilar to Albany, Georgia in its Negro problem. Over eighty per cent of Albany's Negroes live in five of the twenty-six census tracts and those moving into Albany are settling down in these same areas. Part of the reason for this segregation is poor education. If these people had better education, they could obtain better-paying jobs and move into better housing in other sections of the city.

We hope, through a program of individual tutoring, to help the students in those areas in which they are weakest and, in this way, try to keep them from dropping out of school. We also hope that this can be the genesis of some sort of civil-rights group in Albany. The only way we can hope for success, however, is if enough Albany State students decide to sacrifice one or two hours a week during the summer session (June 24-August 14) to help. In spite of the fact that we will have the sympathies and possible help of the Albany city administration, the Trinity Institution, and many adults in the city, the plan has no chance of success without college students to do the tutoring.

If you are going to be in the Albany area this summer during the above period, the young people would appreciate your help. This will be a chance to help the people of Albany and to gain valuable experience in teaching and working with people. The requirements for participation are simply a willingness to donate a little time; a willingness to learn; and a capacity for adapting to new situations as they arise.

We would all admit that a great injustice is being done to the Negroes in this country, and most of us advocate a change in the situation. This is a chance for every one of us to help bring this change about. Are there any volunteers?

J. Marcow

---

#### STUDENTS PLAN MALL "COKE SHOP"

A dozen college students plan to spend their summer evenings running a "coke shop" for teenagers in the South Mall area.

According to one of their leaders in the Campus Christian Council at State University, they think of it partly as a "service project," providing recreation for the teenagers. But they also see something in it for themselves. Natalie Gillette, chairman of the planning committee for the "Summer Service Group," said:

"We hope this may help break down some barriers so we can get to know the young people of this part of the city that is going through such an upheaval."

Mr. Gillette said they want to find a vacant store for their "coke shop" somewhere in or near the South Mall area. They'd like it to be central to a large number of teenagers.

In the evenings the shop would be open to anyone who wanted to come in for "honest talk on a free and easy basis," Mrs. Gillette said. And there would be dancing and games. The shop would be open at night from Monday through Friday, probably from around July 1 to mid-August.

Some of the college students who will be running the shop are experienced in this kind of venture. Three of them worked in a similar service project last summer at Temple Baptist Church in the Arbor Hill section. This year, Mrs. Gillette said, they decided to move to a section of the city which is going through a turmoil of change and where they think the need for recreation of this kind is pressing. And they want to concentrate just on teenagers--last year they provided recreation for younger children as well.

The college students will spend their days at jobs or at summer school. They plan to gather for a common meal each night before going to the "coke shop." They will volunteer their time. The project will be sponsored by the Campus Christian Council with backing from the Board of College Work of the Council of Churches.