

RELIGION

Journal of Kansas



Vol. 18

No. 2

January 1981

Biography of a Clergyman: Carlyle Marney

by
Homer D. Henderson

I first met Carlyle Marney at Southern Methodist University in 1958. I was an undergraduate student, and he was the lecturer for the university's religious emphasis week. He said one thing I did not understand but never forgot: "There is a difference between being a 'good person' and a Christian." That remark set my Bible-belt fundamentalism and my adolescent piety on the way to growth.

Marney and I again crossed paths at Yale University where I was assigned to be his student host during a visit he made to the Divinity School. After listening to one of my sermons in homilectics class, he offered only one critique: "Son, you shot every bird in the woods and didn't leave anything for your people to hunt!"

Again, in the fall of 1977, Carlyle Marney influenced my life and ministry. I spent three weeks at Interpreter's House at Lake Junaluska, North Carolina. Marney founded and directed this ecumenical retreat for parish clergy. One evening, he suggested to me, "Butch, you're not any sicker or any weller than the rest of us, and maybe if you come to know that, you can preach grace." I never saw him again.

Recently, working on my Doctor of Ministry degree through Drew University, I have had the opportunity to meet Dr. Marney afresh. In a small, yet thoughtful, way I could celebrate his poignant incarnation of God's grace to me and my ministry as a pastor. My class was assigned to write a paper based upon the biography of a clergyman. For countless reasons, I chose Mary Kratt's *Marney* (Myers Park Baptist Church, 1979). What follows is that paper, submitted with the hope that what it conveys of Marney might help others as much as he helped me. It is good at last to join others in offering him some small tribute.

Carlyle Marney

(July 8, 1916, Harriman, Tennessee—July 5, 1978,
Lake Junaluska, North Carolina)
Senior Minister, Myers Park Baptist Church,
Charlotte, North Carolina, 1958-67

One has gone before us into a Manhood and a Community that lies within our reach. The method is dialogical and required us to hear each other. The setting is cruciform and demands our lives and fortunes. The characters are human. The drama has consequence—we can afford to work at being brothers to the race because we have met here, and there, too, a very great Grace.

(Marney, Sermon, Christmas Eve, 1965)

The biography chosen for this assignment is unique. Although it is by a single author, it is also the biography of a pastor written by the congregation he served. The author serves an editorial and conjunctive function. In one way, Mary Kratt's book is a tribute, as it was intended to be. In a deeper sense, it is a revealing portrait of a clergyman as seen through the eyes of the people to whom he ministered.

The Central Theological Foundation—Incarnation

Every sermon he gave, every book he wrote, even his style of life and ministry, is a testimony to Carlyle Marney's preeminent conviction, namely, that of the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ. Were it not for his high view of human potential, often bordering upon an exaltation of human possibility,

the kenotic theory of incarnation would serve as a convenient index to his theology. As a point of reference, Marney is in concert with Henri Nouwen's interest in the category of being, as opposed to the styles of having and doing. In contrast, however, Marney is much more of a traditional Christian humanist than he is a kenotic Biblical theologian. "Humanism has always been my heresy. That some of my compeers have thought it stupid is no comfort to me."

In the more operative arena of applied ministry, one of Marney's Southern Baptist clergy colleagues testified:

I suspect that I never would have discovered without his telling me that the incarnation is real. I really didn't think it was real until Marney made it real. You see the traditional Southern Baptist doesn't believe in incarnation. They believe Jesus is God. That's not incarnate. Jesus is man. And uniquely man; but man and to be human is ultimate.

The call to be fully human, to be one's unique self, free of the idolatrous pursuit of making the self a graven image through homage to any supports of having or doing, was consistently evident in Marney's preaching:

The Star of this Hope (for peace) is a man who weighs as much naked as dressed. He transcends the racial, regional, religious buckets of our existence by his ability to move in and out. He has dimensions of selfhood beyond property, beyond regional views of race. He knows that for everybody there is something more to be than American, white, Protestant, and local. . . . One has gone before us into a manhood and a Community that lies within our reach.

Marney's first published affirmation of his incarnational Christian humanism appeared in *The Recovery of Person (A Christian Humanism)* (1963), although this position was obviously the assumption in his earlier writings and ministry:

Is not all this to be explained by the fact that I am in love with man and mankind . . . ? Is it not that I am a humanist and had best confess it? . . . If so, it has left me ripe for a theology of incarnation; for what God who is God would not delight in the joy and the power and the thrust of man at his best forever and ever? From here, who can conceive of a higher joy than being man at his most and his best? This is a theology of identification. So now I find myself willing to talk about his. There's so little I can say for sure of God. . . . it is precisely through men in whom I have felt . . . grace that I have come to kneel, smitten, in the presence of God.

Later, and at last, he wrote in *Priests to Each Other* (1974):

The content of our drama is that it happened once. This is the basis of our preachment. Incarnation as the answer to the matter-spirit risk was acted out. And

*the Word (not silence)
was made flesh (not concept)
and grace (not merit)
ministered to faith (not knowledge)
in such a way that person (not individual)
will act as though he were an
incarnation, too.*

Understanding of Culture— Community Versus Property

Among the idolatrous, debilitating myths of contemporary culture, one is primal; the notion that the opposite of poverty is property. "The terms 'property' and 'poverty' are more nearly homonomous than heteronomous. They are synonyms. The opposite of both is *community*." In an interview two years before his death, Marney responded to Bill Finger of *Christian Century*:

The real issue in Charlotte never was race. It was economics, money, banking, interest rates, loan policies, employment. There is more economic determinism in capitalism than there ever was in communism, I think. So now all this crap we hear about profit being the soul of the nation simply means the nation's lost its soul to property.

Marney's prophetic edge was sharpest in an attack upon those persons, positions, and programs which had become, as he repeated many times, "prisoners of culture." On one occasion, Marney invited one of his parishioners, a young executive in investment banking, to lunch. After a cocktail of listening to the young man's response to Marney's question, "Tell me what you are doing," Marney put his challenge in typical language. The parishioner's description of that encounter speaks for itself:

It was what he didn't say that made you stop and think. At that lunch he paraphrased in about three minutes what I had spent forty-five minutes telling him with all the enthusiasm and excitement that I could muster as a young fellow about what I was doing and why I was doing it. His was about as good a put-down as you could have . . . : "That's wonderful. A nice fence around a perfectly laid plan for your own comfort and enjoyment. Let me tell you what some other people are doing." . . . it was the first time I had ever given any thought or considered that there was an obligation, real obligation, community obligation. . . .

Marney not only preached and ministered but also conducted himself in a manner that revealed his love of culture. He drank too much, smoked too much, travelled too much, read everything, slept too little, was a workaholic, was welcome in every council of deliberation (except some Southern Baptist circles), identified with all sorts and conditions of folk; yet, never selling-out to anything, he never made anyone feel little because they had. Rather, he made those whom he touched feel big enough and strong enough to buy back their own souls by reinvesting their property priorities in community/relational priorities.

Concept of Ministry— Priests to Each Other

In 1964, Marney and Archie Carroll, Myers Park Baptist layperson, were asked to appear on CBS Television's "Look Up and Live." Carroll recalls that program as an illustration of Marney's intense conception of ministry built around relationship in which every Christian is a minister: He contrasted with the other clergy involved in the dialogue who represented the "powers of the pastor (who) says what will be done and who will do this or that." Spelling out his own concept of ministry in *Priests to Each Other*, he says what his biographers saw embodied in his style:

The church you have known all your lives with its intensely dominant and active minister and a passively supporting laity is not God's people in the world; not anymore. . . . the lay people must become the ministry of the church in the world. . . . The aim of the church is not to enlist its laymen in its services; the aim is to put laymen as theological competents in the service of the world!

When Marney left First Baptist Church in Austin to become senior minister at Myers Park Baptist, he did so reluctantly. He said that at Myers Park he had found some Christians who were willing to be "messed with" in the task of becoming theologically competent to minister in the world. The "messaging around," he said, was mutual, a mutual ministering to each other. As Marney wrote his successor after leaving Myers Park, "I learned there, from laity, more than all my work-prior had produced."

With the laity Marney acted as an enabler and catalyst in their process of becoming the Church in the world. His style was often confrontational, often controversial, but always relational. His leadership emerged from within the congregation, always with his people. Even in his involvement in social and political issues, particularly as exemplified in his leadership in the civil rights movement in Charlotte, he was seldom without members of his laity in public councils of deliberation and places of protest. Marney often sounds like Martin Luther, whom he seldom failed to cite in his discussions of ministry. "The priesthood is not an office. It is a relation that permeates the whole body, each of whom is priest to the neighbor." His "theology of identification" flowed in and out of a ministry of identification.

The Mission of the Church— To Humanize

Twenty-five years ago, I was more hopeful about the church as an organization than I am now (1967). But I haven't abandoned the church. I never did stick with it as an end to anything; I stuck with it as a hoe, as a hammer. Church, bank, government, school—whatever—is not an end ever. It's a tool, a means to an end. And I have stayed with this hoe, this hammer, this shovel because 70 to 90 percent of the folks in the South are connected with it in some way.

Such earthy tools represent the Church as a means, an enabler of what Marney called "a community of witness." In this community, members come to recognize themselves as the very Body of Christ, a continuing incarnation of God's love in and for the world. This Church is "the fellowship of the doomed who are being redeemed, but it is more; the Church is the fellowship of those being redeemed who are becoming redeemers."

The mission of the Church is the redemption of itself (the conscience of the Church is a "revolt against bad religion") and the redemption of the world (the will of the Church is an "obsession with the will of the Father and a radical obedience" in the teeth of all orders and claims of society and creation). "The Church is a womb where God's kind of persons happen, are made, are called forth."

When such persons happen, they know themselves as "dispensers of God's grace" and accept their calling to be priests to one another and to the community of humankind. The mission of the Church, in Marney's view and practice, is never separated from the relational task of creating a redeemed community to be a community of redemptive priests in the world.

Marney leaves one begging for the content, the dynamic of this redemption which is the Church's priesthood and mission. Even in the practice of ministry, as his biographers repeatedly observe, he received criticism from the laity because he was eloquent but obscure, difficult to understand. Marney reflects that criticism in a sharing of his own wrestling with the content of redemption. Following an observation that the Church is long on diagnosis and short on cure, he goes on to say:

When one tries to talk to this, he is in trouble; he is in trouble if he does or if he does not. There is and can be, I believe, a church that has something to give to this time. There are some biblical categories of meaning that are deathless. But when I tried to speak of this in sermons, I lost my grip. It was not clear even to me! The rocket did not fire; we never got off the pad. I added and added, but the brew would not jell . . . (nevertheless) . . . fundamentally, the hope, the biblical hope, is in new men.

The creation of that "new man" and a new humanity is the specific, and this humanizing process occurs as the priesthood of the Church accepts its vocation to move others toward personal health and wholeness and toward social justice and responsibility. That "recovery" of authentic human "being" empowered by the grace of God's incarnation in human being is the mission of the Church.

The Practice of Ministry

Carlyle Marney preached what he practiced. It is impossible to imagine how anyone else could deliver one of his sermons with even a small degree of its original effectiveness. His conviction that every person is a unique incarnation of God's image in humankind is nowhere better illustrated than in the message he preached which was uniquely incarnate in his own personhood and personality.

"He created a mood and flung it up against the chancel wall and you were either in it or out of it. And if you were in the mood, you got the mood and felt it. You went away and you felt that something really happened. . . . But if anybody said, 'What did he say?' you said, 'I'll be damned if I know.'" Such responses by the laity attest to his relational, pastoral style of preaching. When asked how he began his sermon preparation, how he put together so much literary, philosophical, and Biblical material, where he found so many homespun illustrations, he quoted *Martin Buber*: "In the beginning is relation."

Another layperson observed that any ten listeners would produce ten different responses to his preaching. His preaching arose out of community and could be heard only in relationship. What was his content? "If you ask people who were there, they will most likely speak of taking off masks with one another, or humanism, conflict, the pilgrimage of finding where you have come from and where you are at, priesting, learning what to discard from the past, openness, relationship

As a Myers Park member reflected:

What I experienced most was that he called one forth to be somebody, not to lean against a post and wait like the Chosen People at the waters of Babylon for what is going to happen, but to find strength within my own self to put to use and to become.

Pastoral care for Marney was the practice of what he preached. Even as one who travelled widely to lecture and teach and who often stayed up through an entire night absorbed in study, Marney was accessible. Although he told his congregation, "I have not come to hold your hands. Even when you're in the hospital, I don't know whether I'm coming to see you," he loved to frequent homes and offices of his laity. He especially made himself available to lonely persons, to those in grief or in conflict, and to children. "I never pass a child without trying to catch his eye," Marney once remarked. His ministry of presence is reflected in these words of a father whose son had been hit by a car:

Marney got to the hospital soon after the ambulance and stayed and stayed and stayed. . . . It wasn't that he dropped in and said hello and said a word of prayer, but he stayed, very relaxed, smoking that pipe, very quiet, would keep the conversation going and just somehow found the things to say or sit close to you and say nothing.

Christian nurture is to enable the process of becoming "God's kind of persons." In that process, Marney's assumption was always, "A preacher who doesn't stretch you is no good." His preaching stretched his listeners to understand, to read. His love of argument stretched those who would argue with him to be clear in their expression of faith and selfhood and to face hard questions.

His idea of "messing" with his congregation meant that they should be challenged to give up their elementary Sunday School theology and take a leap of faith. "Risk! Marney led the way—always risking.

. . . Risked little truths for Truth. Open, always, for new light to break through." The search for that truth and light is a dialogical process in the whole congregation with the pastor leading the way by asking the questions that stretch:

Most of us church folks are not responsibly free—we are just "sorta loose." We hire a man to tell us that we are free and how we can keep this freedom. We expect him to tell us lots of things, but mostly we want him to tell us what to do in such a nice way that we don't have to do this or anything else.

But what if he himself does not know what we are to do? What if he just asks questions? What if he keeps claiming that answers have to come from congregations, not from pulpits? What if he keeps presenting the Gospel as a set of demands he cannot himself resolve? What if he keeps saying that preaching is a conversation most of which the congregation must contribute? And what if most of what he hears is a mutter?

For the church as a community of witness, the redeemed becoming redeemers, worship is the identifying act of the church as the corporate Body of Christ. One of Marney's oft-repeated observations was that the church either happened or didn't happen in worship. If he missed that happening in public worship, he sought it and challenged others to seek it in their "private church." But private never meant a sacrifice of corporateness or community or relation. The liturgy, the work of the people of God, is always from and in and for community. The Church is the continuing incarnation of God in the Body of Christ; worship is the ritual recovery of that identity, a corporate reminder.

Worship happens, or it does not happen, or it only seems to happen and so the church lives or dies or only seems to live. Here we (never I), the whole community of the faithful, come into the presence of God to adore, to confess, to give thanks, to proclaim and to hear, to respond and to partake . . . ; we are called to serve God; we make up our minds to serve him; and we go forth to obey. Here God is in his people at worship and at work. For the worship overspreads the work and vice versa.

Marney's style of church administration was management through personal relationships, relying more on personal persuasion toward growth and democracy than upon aggressive, up-front pastoral authority. Believing that the community of witness was always in the process of redeeming itself, he was able to accept the limitations of the congregation's sense of responsibility and scope of vision as well as the possibilities.

He was always patient in waiting for others to catch-up to the point of decision or risk which he believed the congregation should make. In a conversation with the president of the Myers Park Women, he encouraged her in the throes of her own administrative frustration, "Sarah, do you really ever think

that there would be a corporate action on anything by the congregation?" Thus, administration is serving as priest to one another.

A relational ministry of identification and presence made operative by prodding and caring, by preaching and listening, flowed consistently among all Marney's roles. His personhood was his witness:

I remember Marney talking about going to that meeting in which this restaurant integration was planned and coming out so very proud of the laymen, two of his own. He said he was weeping as he came out because of what he had seen his men do. This in a way was part of his contribution to the community. He did not do the visible things—like he was never president of the Ministers' Association or involved in a large way in the United Appeal. But he worked with this community of the church and the leadership in more intimate and personal ways. He was sort of in the background of what happened. . . . He didn't make speeches. . . . Presence was his style.

Carlyle Marney lived and ministered "as if he were an incarnation too." His relational style, his willingness to be himself and to enable others to be, his insistence upon an egalitarian priesthood of all, his heresy toward humanism, his deep, down-home Christian piety, his sense of identification with all sorts and conditions of folk were strengths in his practice of ministry. Yet they encouraged an error, a personality cult among laity and some clergy.

It is a perilous irony and instructive paradox that those who seek to enable others often become objects of dependency. Those clergy who insist with greatest passion that the pastor is not the center find themselves "most beloved pastors" too often at the very center of the congregation's energy and identity. Marney lived in that tension and handled it better than most of us. He knew when to quit, when to leave, and how to die. In the process, he helps us to know a little better "One (who) has gone before us into a Manhood and a Community that lies within our reach"

Homer D. Henderson is Senior Pastor of Plymouth Congregational Church (United Church of Christ), Lawrence, Kansas. Butch is an officer of the Board of the Kansas School of Religion. With degrees from Southern Methodist and Yale, he is currently in Drew University's D. Min. program. We asked him to share this part of the program.

Cow Veneration in India

by
Robert N. Minor

Though an important symbol elsewhere (e.g., in ancient Egypt, Nuer of Nilotic Africa), in India the cow is a symbol of divine benevolence and a sacred being to be protected and revered. Its products are "gifts" to be used by spiritual cleansing. W. N. Brown lists five elements which have resulted in the sanctity of the cow in India: its importance for Vedic sacrifice; its figurative usage in Vedic literature which later was taken literally; prohibitions against killing a Brahman's cow; the doctrine of "non-injury"; and association of the cow with the mother-goddess. The importance of the cow as food and the symbol of cow protection as an affirmation of religious solidarity against Muslim invaders should be added to this list.

Though the bull is not protected as the cow is in modern India, seals from the Indus valley civilization depict bulls as objects of veneration. In the Vedas both the bull and the cow are at times called *aghnya*, "not to be killed." Most interpret this as an indication of the early sanctity of these animals, but W. N. Brown notes that the epithet is used as an appositive to *dhenu*, "milk cow," or in contexts which refer to its ability to give milk or to reproduce. This indicates that the cow was not to be slain because of its economic or reproductive value. In the *Rigveda*, cattle represent wealth and are sought in prayer to the gods. They are one of the most important sacrificial victims, as are the products of the cow.

The cow was regularly used as food, especially at times of the entertainment of guests. Panini (*Sutra* III. 4.73) calls a guest *goghna*, "one for whom a cow is slain." Yajnavalkya, a great Vedic sage and metaphysician, declares, "I for one eat it (beef), provided that it is tender (*amsala*)." (*Satapata-brahmana* III.1.2.21) In the *Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad*, eating beef is part of a prescription for vigorous offspring and in the later *Sutra* literature the eating of meat is taken for granted but restrictions are placed upon the manner of killing the animal.

The Vedas also use the cow figuratively. The gods are called "cow-born," *gojatah*. The cosmic waters are regularly referred to as cows, e.g., they are said to come forth like lowing cows in R.V. 1.23.2. The goddess Aditi is called a cow and the earthly cow is addressed as Aditi. The cow is also equated with the earth, heaven, and speech.

Four hymns of the *Atharvaveda* are entirely devoted to securing protection for the possessions of the Brahman, especially his cow. To injure the cow of the Brahman was equal to injuring the Brahman himself (5.18; 5.19; 12.4; 12.5).

In the fourth century the teachings of the followers of the Buddha and the Jainas emphasized the doctrine of *ahimsa*, "non-injury" (see *ahimsa*), which was less important in Vedic literature. This doctrine did not single out the cow as its object, but

was meant to protect all living things. Both the Pali literature and the Epic literature, however, indicate a chasm between the ideal and popular practice. Butchers (*goghataka*, "sellers of beef") are mentioned, as are hunters and trappers. Indian rulers as late as the twelfth century A.D. attempted to enforce a ban on meat eating; for example, the Jain king Kumarapala of Gujarat (r. 1142-1172). On the other hand, the *Mahabharata* warns that the killer of a cow will be reborn in hell for as many years as there are hairs on its body (13.74.4). The *Manudharma-sastra* is inconsistent: including cow-slaughter in a list of crimes (11.60), but allowing the eating of "consecrated flesh" (5.27-42). The *Arthasastra* likewise protects the cow in 2.26; 3.10, but also speaks of cattle "fit only for the supply of meat" in 2.19.

The cow is the symbol of the sacred in the Epic ideal. It is especially sacred to Shiva, whose vehicle is Nandi the bull (see Shiva, Nandi). Vishnu's heaven is called the "world of cows," *goloka*, and cow dung is viewed as a symbol of his discus. Kamadhenu, a cow associated with the Vedic god Indra, symbolizes the cow as Mother, the provider of needs. She was produced at the churning of the primordial ocean by the gods and now grants all human desires.

By the end of the Epic period, as reflected in the Puranas, the sanctity of the cow is expressed in terms which are used today. The cow is said to be created on the same day as the god Brahma and cow-slaughter is equal to Brahmicide. The *Bhagavata Purana* (1.16-17) notes that lack of reverence for the cow is one of the symptoms of the final age (see *yuga*) and emphasizes the cow as a part of the life of the god Krishna, a cowherd. *Vishnu Purana* 1.13 proclaims that the cow was given to provide vegetation for the earth.

The modern period has witnessed an on-going struggle between those who cherish the symbol and those who would emphasize economic issues. Gandhi claimed "cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the World" because the cow represents the indissoluble bond between the human and the subhuman and an example of complete giving for others. A directive of the Indian Constitution (no. 48) attempts to compromise: condemning cow-slaughter but recommending the use of breeding techniques. The Jana Sanhg Hindu communal political party Manifesto of 1966 advocates an amendment to the Constitution banning cow-slaughter because, "The Cow is the national point of honor."

Robert N. Minor, not a stranger to our readers, is Assistant Professor of Religious Studies.

What's Going on in Religious Study A Series of Mini-Conferences—and A Graduate-Credit Course

1. *What are some important recent trends in Roman Catholic theology?*
2. *How can we understand the interaction of cultural values and power dynamics in contemporary sexuality?*
3. *How are symbols changing in our society, and what do they tell us about the inner person?*
4. *How are the biblical faiths challenged by modern biblical research?*
5. *Religious cults—are they more or less of a threat to individual freedom than some popular reactions to them?*
6. *Is unity or diversity more desirable in contemporary religious life?*

These are some of the questions that will be pursued by well-known scholars in a series of one-day mini-conferences at the University of Kansas. The conferences are designed to help up-date knowledge of "what's going on" in some aspects of the study of religion.

Any interested person is welcome to attend any or all of the sessions. Those wishing credit may enroll for 3 credit hours in the course, "Special Topics in Religion: Religion in American Society" (REL 602).

The Kansas School of Religion and the Department of Religious Studies are cooperating to present this series of mini-conferences on alternate Mondays, beginning January 26, 1981. The topics and the speakers are:

Jan. 26—"Recent Trends in Roman Catholic Theology." Speakers—Dr. Denise Carmody, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Religion, Wichita State University; Dr. John Carmody, Adjunct Professor, Wichita State University. The Carmodys are authors of the recent Harper and Row publication, *Contemporary Catholic Theology: An Introduction*. John Carmody has written *Theology in the 1980's* (Westminster, 1980); Denise Carmody published *Women and World Religion* (Abingdon Press) in 1979.

Feb. 9—"Symbol, Psyche and Society." Speaker—Dr. Charlotte Ellen, author of *Meet Me in the Middle* and *Counseling for Liberation*; co-author, with Howard Clinebell, of *The Intimate Marriage*. Dr. Ellen is a therapist in private practice in Claremont, California. The story of symbols in her own encounter with personal and social transformation is told in "The Second Birth of Charlotte Ellen," *Womanspirit Magazine*, Fall, 1979.

Feb. 23—**"Untangling the Skeins of Sexual Confusion: Cultural Values and Power Dynamics in Contemporary Sexuality."**

Speaker—Dr. Beverly Wildung Harrison, Professor of Christian Social Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Dr. Harrison's most recent article is "Anger is a Work of Love: Christian Ethics for Women and Other Strangers," *Union Quarterly Review*, January, 1981. Other writings include "The Politics of Energy Policy" in Dieter Hessel (ed.) *Energy Ethics* (Association Press, 1979), and "Does the First Amendment Bar the Hyde Amendment?," *Christianity and Crisis*, March 5, 1979.

Mar. 9—**"Religious Cults and the Religious Anti-Cultists."**

Speaker—Dr. Anson D. Shupe, Jr., Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Texas at Arlington. Shupe is co-author, with David G. Bromley, of *The New Vigilantes: Deprogrammers, Anti-Cultists and the New Religions* (Sage Publications, 1980), and *"Moonies" in America: Cult, Church and Crusade* (Sage, 1979).

Mar. 23—**"Fresh Hearing of the Christian Gospel in the Traditions of Hebrew Scriptures."**

Speaker—Dr. Walter Brueggemann, Professor of Old Testament and Dean of Academic Affairs, Eden Theological Seminary. His writings include *In Man We Trust: The Neglected Side of Biblical Faith* (John Knox Press, 1972) and *The Prophetic Imagination* (Fortress Press, 1978). *The Christian Century* has his recent article, "Covenant as a Subversive Paradigm" (Nov. 12, 1980).

Apr. 6—**"Unity and Diversity in Contemporary American Religious Life."**

Members of the faculty of the Department of Religious Studies will present this session. Topics to be included are "Dialogue with Other Religions," "Jewish-Christian Dialogue," "Does Holy Spirit Unite or Divide?" and "The On-Going Liberal-Conservative Battle." Resource persons will include Professors Robert Minor, Daniel Breslauer, Timothy Miller, and John Macauley.

Each Monday session is scheduled from 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Registration is at the Department office, Room 103, in Smith Hall. The day's schedule will include a major presentation by the speaker; small group discussion with the speaker and the faculty members; opportunities for individual conferences with faculty on related topics; optional research time in the Library; a summary discussion period with the speaker and conference participants.

Persons enrolled in the course Religion 602 will attend all six conferences and a seventh meeting on Monday, April 27, for presentations of papers related to the content sessions.

For more information ask:

**Department of Religious Studies
Irma I. Smith Hall
University of Kansas 66045
(913) 864-4663**

KSR Scholars— 1980-81

Sandra Buhlig

Gary Smith

Eleanor Cooley

Nosa Eke

Upon faculty recognition, four students are awarded scholarships and grants by the Kansas School of Religion. The recipients are designated KSR Scholars. Sandra Buhlig was recognized as the top scholar. Gary Smith was awarded the KSR Fellowship.

The Kansas School of Religion does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, national or ethnic origin in the administration of its scholarship programs.

Watch for Moses

Eldon Tefft of the KU School of Fine Arts plans to complete the Moses statue for Irma I. Smith Hall this spring.

With the School of Religion's celebrated Burning Bush window, the statue represents the scene from the University seal.

There will be a casting party when it's ready.

New Roof For Smith

It finally happened—a complete repair of the roof on Irma I. Smith Hall! Owned by the Kansas Bible Chair and leased by the Kansas School of Religion, the building is made available for free use by the University. It was erected in 1967 from private donations.

This major repair is a responsibility of the School of Religion in its continuing relationship with the University.

TRAVERSE LOG

Discussions about religion and science got awfully old before most of us were very young. But the relationship between the two is back in the hot and cold running media, now haunting us with a new mortgage in the old debate.

From flint rock to computer chip, scientific tinkering has allowed the human race to alter the world for its benefit, over 2,000,000 years, building up to this age of creature comfort and prosperity. The process is dramatized in the film *2001*. When the tool-making ape throws his crude club to the sky, we watch it spin upward, fade-out, and then grow and become a great space station, reflecting the sunlight. It is an impressive show biz beauty and an indicative cartoon of some human history.

Not to get carried away with the hoo haw of scientific ingenuity, we must set this picture in its proper frame: as humanity has become more skilled and efficient at scientifically changing the world to suit itself, it has lost progressively the ability to control the consequences of the changes. While this was going on, religion sallied in and around the process looking for its meaning. Eventually religion deeded its homestead to science. Eased along by Cartesian reasoning, science became the sacred cow. Precedents and proofs to tidy up the truth became holy if they were scientific. By now the sacrosanct Inductive Method has bumbled us into some dead ends: we have developed answers to some questions that frighten us terribly as they deplete and pollute our world. Science worried little about controlling the change.

Clearly, the next great advance had better help personality to the top of the upward spin.

Lest I lose my readers—all two of them—in a platitude that religion should cap science, I emphasize this observation about religion. Religion found capitulation to the Inductive Method tempting. If Christianity could be pictured as logical, we thought, it would be believable. Since Aquinas's thirteenth century, many religionists looked for some religious Aristotle to get faith into the scientific groove. Some still look, hoping for an answer quickly and easily, something like a chicken trying to lay an egg on an escalator. The process is too soon over.

Jastrow's recent book *God and the Astronomers* ends with a picture of scientists climbing a high mountain to discover Truth. Upon reaching the summit they discover theologians already sitting there. If religionists actually are up there in pursuit of Truth, I hope they are unapologetically secure on the peak, glad about where they are, and proud of their distinction.

Religion knows additional places to look for Truth, intuitive, experiential, and surely inexplicable. "To know a primrose is a higher thing than to know all the botany of it," wrote an old poet. Now, as Sue Spencer observes, many botanists are buying that.

-LFT

RELIGION

(USPS 460-280)

Published quarterly in October, January, April and July by Kansas School of Religion at The University of Kansas at Lawrence, Kansas 66045.

Editor, Lynn Taylor
Editorial Coordinator,
Nancy Colyer

Nonprofit Org.

U. S. Postage

PAID

Lawrence, Kansas
Permit No. 65