

Willis E. Elliott, NBC Mike Moss 26 Apr 70 interview, in series of radio and television programs paralleling Dr. Elliott's northern Westchester course "Suburban Man and the Values Revolution."

We are talking with Dr. Willis Elliott, the professor of practical theology and director of lay theological education at New York Theological Seminary....In the past two programs we have been discussing some of the problems that face people in suburbia in terms of the changes in value structures with which they have to contend because life seems to be moving at an ever faster pace. Suburbia has become a place where the vision of everything being all right with the world has become defeated. Dr. Elliott, perhaps we can start there and use that as a springboard for our discussion.

Yes, Mike. Suburbia has become a place of unhappy and untranquil psyche. It did represent, as you say, an effort of people to move out of a fast-changing world into a world of continuity. Suburbia was a kind of counterculture in itself. In the suburb where I live, many of the livingrooms are in 18th-century decor, but the men come into Manhattan to work--about the 21st century in relation to most of the culture, so that when the husbands and fathers return home at night they move three centuries backward, and this is playing the nostalgia game, the game of yesterday; but it is just that, a game, and the city, especially the inner city, is more and more penetrating the psyche and lives of suburbia. For example, the drug revolution now has hit the suburban home, so it isn't just the psyche worrying about urban violence--it is now the suburbanite's own children who are responding in their psyches to all of the cultures and subcultures and countercultures that are agitating our civilization.

Dr. Elliott, do you feel that the value structures in the suburbs now are behind the value structures in the cities, the changes--are the suburbs lagging behind?

It's hard to speak so generally about it; but I think one can say that the suburbs, especially those in the higher socio-economic levels, do see themselves as dug in in favor of the values which built the American way of life. But the problem here is that value exists at two levels: (1) operational values (individualism, thrift, honesty, etc.), on top of (2) deeper values (the love of God, obedience to the Spirit of God, the aim of life as the praise of God and the joy of the

whole creation, etc.). The latter is the great biblical heritage from the Puritans, which has existed as a deep substructure of the values of honesty, industry, etc. that spells what we call the Protestant work-ethic and the American way of life. Now what has happened is that the upper layer of values (honesty, punctuality, etc.) has lost this substructure. Most people in the suburbs find God (though they may not be conscious of it) quite unreal and therefore the praise of God a quite unreal ritual, though they may exercise "freedom of religion" in going to church on Sunday. The critic of the suburban way of life consequently has the feeling that there is very little underneath to sustain these upper values of what we otherwise call the capitalist society. Of course where it really hits the suburbanite is when his children say he's a hypocrite because he's living for a set of values (he claims) that his life really isn't committed to.

Is there a question here, too, of responsibility in the suburbs? This has been an old Puritan-type value--"responsibility"--as far back as this country goes. But the question of responsibility seems to be getting more and more attention.

Yes, "responsible" is a very "heavy" word as young people say today. In the older generation, and especially the suburbanite, it means two things: (1) the responsible person with individual values [such as honesty], and (2) accountability for and to the inherited institutions [such as the government, the school, the church]; whereas suburban youth more and more think of responsibility in terms of the structure of society: alongside the individual ethic of their parents there lies, as they see it, the need for a social ethic, a social sensitivity, a social conscience. And when they confront the question of responsibility to institutions, they counter with the question whether the institutions are themselves responsible. If they arrive at the point of being convinced that those institutions are themselves irresponsible and the enemy of the human thing, the generation gap becomes more serious, a values gap. I'm afraid that's where we are now with increasing numbers of our suburban youth--so when we use the phrase, as we shall more and more, "the responsible suburb," the

question of how the suburb can use its resources, at both generational levels, to raise the question of the suburb's responsibility to its city, to the whole of megalopolis, this is going to be a more and more lively and productive question.

Dr. Elliott, you mentioned the differences between the suburban adult and the suburban youth. Is there a way of ameliorating the differences, getting them down to the vanishing point?

They can't be eliminated because we are entering a radically new world, and young people know more about what the questions of this new world are than their parents do. I really think that we are, as Margaret Mead has said, in an immigration situation. Former generations of Americans came here with their children, who picked up the English language more easily and caught all the culture-signals faster and deeper, so that their parents became an embarrassment to them, and the roles of teacher and pupil were reversed: the children became their parents' teachers. This time, we have not moved in space but in time--an Atlantic Ocean of time, say three centuries, so that the parents are in relation to their children three hundred years old, and the world they are living in is so strange to them that they need to ask their children what the real questions are; and the parents really can't hope to learn well the language of the new world. The more they speak of the old world--its terrain, its customs, etc.--the more pathetic they become to youth: really, a major human crisis.

Dr. Elliott, isn't this also a problem for the young people--that if their parents must come to them to find out what the questions are, must youth not also go to the older generation so that the latter's experience can come to bear in the refining of the questions, as we were discussing just before the program began--and then both work together in refining the answers?

Indeed so, Mike! Parents have had comparatively long experience of the process of questioning and answering, and that experience of the process can be made available to young people if the parents can open up and become vulnerable to young people and get over their uptightness--then what the parents have to give becomes visible to youth. But when the parent lives and acts within a frozen struc-

ture of questions and answers (i.e., acts like a tribal man rather than a future man), the children just turn off, so that what the parents have to give is unavailable to their children.

Dr. Elliott, do you feel that there is in our land now a radical youth culture?

Yes, I would say, Mike, that there are several radical youth cultures. The difference between the 70s and the 50s, let's say, is that back in the 50s we still had one culture in America (or rather were less conscious of the subcultures, and had no counter-culture)--a dominant culture, though we had many subcultures. Now "s-u-b" means under, and you aren't frightened of what is under--unless it's a bomb. "Under" here means suppressed and controlled, as was true of the black man when he was "nigger." Now all of these subcultures of the 50s are emerging as countercultures, "against" and on the same level as the traditional dominant culture; the WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant). The options thus are open, and this is frightening. Compare what has happened in this period to the black man. When he was "nigger," he was not so scary to the white man. But when the Negro became "black" in coming up to the level of the white man first with threat and then with promise, the white man became a "honkie" to the black man: "honkie" being the derogatory name parallel to "nigger." In the white man's nightmare a reversal occurred signaled by such expressions as "black power," "black separatism," and "black nationalism"--looking toward a real cultural exchange, the great word we're using for this being "pluralism." I have the hope, I have the faith in God, that this is going to happen for the benefit of all, that America will get the courage to entertain countercultures, cultural options, and the humility to make the ensuing dialog enriching to America and man. Maybe it's my current version of the American Dream, but I hope and pray that in this mix of life-styles America will become a model for mankind, for the emergence of what I call global man--or at least one such model. America as "the pioneer society" is in me not a dead image! If we have, I say, the courage and humility to let youth do their thing, as it is becoming necessary to let the black man do his thing, then we shall be able to look back on all of the turmoil of the 60s and 70s and be thankful for it. If indeed this is our faith, we

can even now view the violence, bombings, and threats we're being exposed to as predictions, prophecies, of the renewal of the civilization of dialog, a better America and a better world.

You mentioned that this pluralistic society we are beginning to live in is experiencing the development of subcultures into counter-subcultures. Why? What has caused this radical change in the past 15 or 20 years as opposed to the first years of our nation's history?

I have to use the term "tribe" here, Mike. When the human tribes were separated by mountains in their valleys, the whole tribal structure depended upon a consensus which was ratified by a monopoly of violence within the tribe. The shaman was a combination of priest and governor and judge and policeman down at the clan level, then these functions scattered among several functionaries such as I have used to describe the aspects of the shaman's work--yet all this was within one tribal system: the images, the ideas, the doctrines all had the sanction of dogma, i.e. a teaching that has social power behind it: you can enforce a dogma: people can be told what to think, on pain of ostracism or death for deviance. (In this sense, Maoist China, 1/3rd of mankind, is still "tribal," quite primitive.) But once you remove the power sanction, the violence sanction, against ideas--i.e., when you come to freedom of thought and speech--a dogma deteriorates into a doctrine, something "taught" that you are free to believe or reject no matter who teaches it. (So, increasingly, people in the Catholic tribe feel free to disagree with the Holy Father, and massively so do on the issue of contraception.) Further, a "doctrine" may become even more optional, lose much of its social sanction force, by becoming a "model" that represents something at a greater distance from the reality than is a doctrine, yet serves to provide meaning and testing and shaping. For example, people may stop believing that God loves them--I certainly believe that God loves me; it's the taproot of everything I think and feel and do--but people may say Well, the doctrine that God loves people only means that love is necessary, we can't get along without it. In this case, the "doctrine" has become a "model" for interpretation and action. Further still, the model may degenerate into a mere "image." E.g., Zorba is a kind of love image. But the image may deteriorate and all you have is a "hint." Many contemporary films treat sex as little or no more than a hint of love, so deep a wedge has been driven today between love and sex--

parallel, I think, to the wedge driven between divine and human love today. Then the hint deteriorates down, sometimes, into a zero. In our culture--this is where I see us now--we have made this whole journey from the deterioration of "dogma" on down to absurdity. People believe nothing, yet must believe something, so there's a desperate search for something to believe in. No wonder, Mike, we have radical movements and countercultures, when this process combines with the idealistic struggle for justice and peace! Since you can't live without some meaning-structure in your life, you've got to find a life-structure (i.e., a manner of life centering in a meaning) before you go to bed or at least before breakfast. [It's the great psychotherapist Viktor Frankl who says that the characteristic disease of the modern world is the dessication or drying up of meaning, thus he calls his therapy "logotherapy," meaning therapy, because it aims to help people recover or find centering meaning for their lives.]

Now on the radical side, radical youth split in two directions depending on the meaning and value they are aiming at. One group aims at communion. They have love-ins, they want to feel that they are merging their spirits with each other and probably also with the One, the great Spirit--some going in the Indian American direction, more in the direction of the Eastern religions, "Om," cosmic unity. All of these are looking for communion, and we call this the "hippie" subculture--not just a subculture: a counterculture, freaked out on the general American culture. [I sometimes refer to Jesus as a double freak. Though at first he went out into the wilderness, later he came back and was crucified, and out of him then came new life. I have lived for several days at a time in a number of hippie communes and colonies, and have pointed out there the contrast, that the typical hippie --if we can so speak--is only a single freak, who will be responsible for the culture only if he finds a way to freak back into the culture and make a witness.]

The other radical movement among youth aims not at communion primarily but at justice. Here are the militants, white and black and (far fewer) brown and red. From the viewpoint of culture-analysis we might call the first radical group, the hippie movement, "dionysiac," and the militant movement "apollonian." If I may add a prophecy, I believe there will occur a coalition of these two movements, a coalition counterculture with voting clout. If then this coalition aligns itself with youth in general, blacks in

general, and the poor in general, we shall have the makings of a brand new American society. While it won't be the Kingdom of God, the ideal, it should be closer to Jesus in combining communion and justice: Jesus was always talking in one breath about communion with God and how you are treating your neighbor, and how God should be truly worshipped and your neighbor served. He was especially sensitive about the unjust power-distribution in society: the strong putting burdens on the backs of the weak-poor.

I'm still thinking about that process of deterioration from "dogma" to "zero." Some young people say you have to wipe out the old and then build the new. If they come to power without surrendering their radicality, will they not just reverse the direction and lead from "zero" to a new dogma?

One of man's unfortunate tendencies, Mike, is to go from one extreme to another and from one direction to its opposite! So I call myself not a "counterculturalist" but a "transculturalist," for I believe it's possible to have a radical revolution that incorporates all the truly human values of the past--whereas the rejection of the past's values is what the usual revolutionary claims is necessary. Years ago I used to play tennis weekly with a man who was on the original committee that shaped up the Russian Revolution. For six weeks in the Stuttgart Conference of 1910 his seat was on Lenin's righthand, and he as a Christian kept complaining to Lenin that atheism was not necessary to the revolution, to which Lenin kept replying "We have to make a radical break with the past," and in breaking the power of the state we must also break the power of the state church, which uses God to sanction whatever the Czar wants. Lenin was, I think, right: the tight alliance of church with state is both a strength to the church (on its institutional side) and a risk (to its message, and even its existence). But unfortunately the atheism got so built into the Communism--got so raised, in your words, to the status of new "dogma"--that when the pendulum reversed, anti-Communism claimed all the power of God and of the church against Communism. But the thrust of Communism was toward justice, toward the juster society--so we get the terrible agony and counterpropaganda, in the Vietnam situation, of people saying that

Communists are atheists and we should not feel therefore too bad about shooting them! From the values standpoint, Mike, that kind of thinking is so fouled up as to be an agonizing instance of what the Greeks called hubris, man's tendency to go to extremes and out of bounds and so violate both his own humanity and God. It's something we have to counter with the wisdom of age. Here I refer to what you said earlier: Isn't it possible for the older generation to relate to the younger generation in such a way that the younger generation can use what the older generation has to offer? Yes, it is difficult; very difficult, but it is possible.

I think what we're talking about there, too, is the problem of communication. This is one of the most serious problems in the suburbs: how communicate with others in a different generation, or peer group, or socio-economic grouping, or a different educational level? How do you bridge these gaps? Does this have anything to do with the value system with which we live?

Yes! In several passages Freud speaks of man's two primal feelings as fear and longing. When fear becomes stronger than longing, the person becomes necrophilous ("death-loving"), he moves toward thanatos, death. But when longing is stronger than fear, the person is biophilous ("life-loving") and moves toward eros (not just sexuality, but creativity in love). As I see it, Mike, what's happened is that things have moved so fast that the older generation has gotten so fearful that it has organized itself around defense rather than advance and thus has become the enemy of change. Now at that point all the forces that move within and toward change, including what I would call the basic force, namely God as the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ as the Lord of the Future, stand against the older generation or rather that mass within it that is frozen against change and tries to freeze out change-agents of any generation. When one gets one's life organized around fear, one stands against God and man and nature and history. Now when you talk about "communication," let's begin with observing that many people cannot even communicate with themselves, in their own hearts, today, to say nothing

of communicating with God or even with others in their peer group, to say nothing of communicating with young people, worst of all the young people in their own home. I would say that that the parent/teenager gap in the suburbs is maximum, for it focuses all of these anxieties. There too, in the suburbs, are the people--some 100,000 of them, to date--who have gotten turned on to the sensitivity movement, had some experience in it--perhaps an awareness weekend or a marathon overnight--and have become convinced they can't even communicate with themselves (so why, they reason, all too many of them, by a perverse logic, should they try to communicate with anyone else?). At Esalen Big Sur a few years ago I took a course called "Opening Up and Letting Go," and in five days we went through some seventy exercises calculated to get us back into touch with our own feelings and into communication with our own depth. Here our culture is so pitifully hung up that one must penetrate through many layers of noncommunication in dealing with the pathology, the sickness, of being unable to communicate across the generation gap.

One more comment on this: Parents generally find this noncommunication so painful from their side that they try to put the blame for it on the young people: "John and Ruth just don't talk with us anymore." Yet probably the major component of the wall is that the parents have given through the years signals, largely non-verbal, that they cannot stand the pain and threat of hearing what young people have to say. It used to be that as children grew up their questions got smaller: a reversal. Most of the people in my generation--I'm 52--asked smaller and smaller questions as their bodies got bigger. But now we have a generation of youth whose questions have remained big as their bodies have gotten big, so now they stand and look into their parents' eyes--because of improved nutrition, probably even look down a few inches--with these enormous, terrifying questions: What is God? What is life all about? How do you know you haven't wasted your life?

You mentioned one thing that goes back to the ancient Greek philosophers, among whom "Know thyself!" was one of the great goals--haven't we seen in the suburbs the development of this goal in many fields?

You must know the depths of your own being before you can really plumb the depths of someone else.. Before communication with others can take place, as you said, communication with yourself has to become viable.

Yes, and now that is a secular parallel to the question in religion, namely individual salvation versus social salvation. ~~Billy Graham e.g. says that if the individual gets right with God, society will straighten up--the secular version of this being that if you can just understand yourself [through the human potential movement or whatnot], just know yourself, then you'll be able to see everything out here as it really is and things will clear up in your personal life and in society.~~ One name for this as a healing perspective is "insight therapy." But all the psychotherapeutic traditions are based on self-insight. But this is a very limited thing and full of overclaims, as the religious parallel is. What we've found is that people in religion who "got saved" as individuals tended to trip out of social responsibility (with some magnificent exceptions, of course), dream of heaven--and produce Marx's description of religion as an "opiate of the people" for this life. In secular version, you get just about the same thing: people get persuaded that they "know" themselves--then they go on inner trips, psychedelic, drugs, whatnot, and they form little groups of mutual support in this world that is largely unreal. These may be pot parties in suburbia or hippie communes.

On the other side, in religion, you have the social gospel, the emphasis on justice and so forth, an emphasis so strong in Jesus; and now more and more in the secular version you have the counterculture appropriating the insight of individual therapy to the question whether the society is so sick that it hardly pays to go to a psychiatrist, because even if thereby you get well, when you go outside his door you'll get sick again. It's the social problem of psychic pollution; and the whole movement now is developing "social therapy," attacking sociopathy [society's sickness] as an earlier intervention than merely running a psychic rescue mission for individuals. Most prominent in this shift is a young British therapist, R.D. Laing, whose book

THE POLITICS OF EXPERIENCE is a holybook in the egghead department of the youth counterculture, and well worth the older generations' attention.

Dr. Elliott, do you feel that things such as sensitivity training and motivation groups have their own set of values that in themselves cause hangups in the people who get involved?

Well, what the whole sensitivity thing tries to do is to get people to, as I said, "open up and let go." But the hangup comes, Mike, with what they discover when they open up: is there anything there? In 1925 T.S. Eliot wrote the poem "Hollow Men." Now, if a person is hollow and gets opened up, what may and probably will result is a new disease, "abyss anxiety," a falling into the infinite hole, the bottomless dry well, of the self--and be in a worse condition. Of this, Jesus tells the parable of sweeping out the house of one devil, who then goes out and finds devil friends, whom he brings back into the house, making it a house of seven devils! I'm afraid the human-potential or sensitivity movement is under severe judgment as to whether it is more than analysis: there must be some way to help a person synthesize himself, "get himself together," "get his thing together," help him in his valuing to new commitments. It's very clear now that if you just open him up, you may find a can of worms or--even worse--nothing. I score the movement, at this point, for irresponsibility to its own highest value, namely personality, the human being.

If you open him up and lay him bare, there has to be some help in moving upward from the zero he may have come down to: how help him to move back up, to new and better commitments?

That's it.

There has to be some basis for this new formulation and formation.

And there is the problem of carry-through. As the churches have got into sensitivity training, there has been more hope, for the church promotes continuity groups over a number of months, even a number of years --giving people, in their weekly meetings, continuing opportunities to work through

what has happened to them in human-potential-movement experiences and in the groups themselves--in contrast to the movement's general design, which is a 4-hour, an overnight, a weekend, or a few days [an ironic secular parallel to "the good old campmeeting days" and the spring and fall "extended evangelistic meetings" of "the oldtime religion"]--after which you are turned loose to shift for yourself, an emperor with no clothes in the cold, cruel world. In the light of this, and other factors, right now the movement is being researched as to whether it's doing more good or more harm.

In your experience, does the movement do any good in helping suburbanites understand the value structure under which they are living and the possible or potential changes in that value structure?

Definitely so. [My experience of it extends back a decade.] The very courage people have in confronting realities about themselves is transposable into the courage to confront realities in their children and in the suburbs, especially in the suburban freakout from city and inner-city problems. I should add this: In instances of deeper Jewish and Christian commitment, the person whom the human-potential movement has opened has resources to sustain him in humility and courage and hope. Here the great values of our biblical heritage, love and justice, correspond beautifully with the two wings of the radical movement: "love" moves toward communion, "justice" moves toward a more humane society.

Does this sensitivity-training movement, the human-potential movement as you call it, Dr. Elliott--does this lead to a crisis of authority for the person? Does it make things more difficult for him, or less?

It makes life more difficult for him in that he cannot simply any longer drift along: he has become a question-raiser about himself. Once you begin to raise profound questions about yourself, you're hooked. Hooked on raising profound questions about the whole of life. In biblical religion we call this "repentance" and "faith." "Repentance means you aren't satisfied with what you've been; "faith"

means that you believe it's possible to become more than you have been. Then you look at your society and are not satisfied with what you see, but you believe it's possible for the society to become more human, more humane, than it has been: that's what the Martin Luther King thing was all about.

I was extremely impressed by the movie KING, although as a reporter I covered all of that story back ten years now. I've never failed to be impressed that the man seemed to have conquered fear,

Yes.

and from conquering fear, possibly by this depth knowledge of himself, he was able to go ahead and make his presence felt, whereas others in the same movement, who had not been able to conquer fear, made no impression.

And not to conquer fear inclines one to violence: when you're really frightened, you begin to scream and hit.

Defense mechanisms.

Yes, they just turn on in your autonomic system. While I'm not a Freudian, the emphasis Freud puts on the battle between fear and longing is beautifully displayed in the case of King, whose longing for a juster society, specifically for the human rights of the black people of America, was so intense that it consumed all his energy and he had no energy left to be afraid for himself. All the energy that in most people gets used up, most of it as sheer waste, on the fear side, in him got sucked over into the longing side.

What about comparing this with the latter efforts of Malcolm X?

An illuminating comparison! Malcolm X is a hero of mine, a man in transition through a number of conversions from a number of "trips," or stages, or visions, or life-styles--not stopping till he was converted to what I call the life-style of "emergent global man," i.e. man who sees himself as a creature on this small globe alongside of other men

whom he sees as more like than different from him, with the result that to exist he must affirm not just his own tribe (race, ethnic group, religion, etc.) but the species. Near the end of his all too short life, Malcolm X got beyond hating the white man to the point of welcoming recruits for humane action wherever they could be found, in whatever tribe. [[The severe problem and danger here is exemplified by Eldridge Cleaver. Like Malcolm X, he opened up from "black is beautiful" to "human is beautiful," and welcomed nonblack recruits. But failing to get much nonblack support, he became embittered and regressed into racism, an ideological hardness: revolution requires ideological hardness, so this signals his conclusion that social-change measures short of revolution will not work in America today.]]

Do you think that this may have an application in the suburbs, that in order to have a satisfactory value-system that has some meaning to the people there, both adults and young people--that they must (1) conquer the fear that arises from not knowing themselves and their own potentialities and (2) develop in themselves a longing for justice beyond any individual, private interests?

Yes, just so, and this is true in politics too. Some few years ago, when I was working toward the levying of a commuter tax, I got a letter from Mayor Lindsay thanking me for promoting a tax on myself as a suburbanite--a tax which, by the way, we managed to achieve. [[An instance, I would say, of enlightened over against unenlightened self-interest: I acted against my short-range interest out of long-range concern for (1) the responsible suburb and (2) the more humane metropolis, extended from an economic to a political nexus.]] The whole of a metropolis or megalopolis--the city in all its rings--should be a political unit, an integrated "polis"; and metropolitan taxation moves in that direction because (1) taxation leads to representation [i.e., power-responsibility] and (2) "where your money is, there will your heart be also." The whole and the parts should be inter-responsible, so suburb should be economically and politically structured in with the inner city. As we become thus more responsible--this is what I mean by "the responsible suburb"--

we come to see justice as an assignment from life itself to our megalopolis, our total city, our metropolitan area--I would say as a religious man, as an assignment from God to every human community, little and big, to work out the terms of justice: how can there be freedom within order, a maximum of freedom within an orderly structure aimed not at power but at liberty? I think the suburbs are going to develop a new type of politician who sees himself and his neighbors as citizens of the whole city. Here I see COCU, the Conference on Church Union looking toward the uniting of nine major denominations, as a model in its "parish," which is to be a membership connection between innercity church, middle-ring church, and suburban church--so when you join a suburban church, e.g., you'll be a member not just of that congregation but also of the other churches of your pie sector right into the inner city.

Do you feel this order and freedom and liberty can be developed? Do you think there is enough consciousness of the need for this in suburbanites today so that this can become a reality?

Yes, I think, Mike, that the fear of the city is modulating now in the suburbs into a concern that all together, in all the city's rings, face the question of survival--"survival" being the great word coming in more and more now in larger contexts also, such as global population-control and national and global pollution. The survival of the cities is more and more seen by the suburbanites as problematic. Being addressed by this question Can we survive? we no longer have the adolescent freedom merely to be afraid: the question is sharpened to How do we get our energies going toward the survival of our city? As soon as you go into survival-concerned action, you lose much of your fear. Educational theory here speaks of "the action-reflection style." At New York Theological Seminary, e.g., we have core groups more than classes, and everything is worked out on the basis of the student's involvement with some particular agony or ecstasy in the city, an engagement on which, with the help of theologians, he reflects in many directions--what has happened to him, what the issue "out there is," what our

biblical heritage may have that can illumine both--a movement from the world to the resources of the Christian faith: we do not begin with the Christian faith and then use it as a cookie-cutter on the world. The man not in action is the fearful man: once you involve yourself in the human situation--here, in the problem of the survival of the cities--the concentration of your energies on problem-solving sucks up much of the fear you had before you went into action.

Dr. Elliott, has this movement you speak of changed the image of God held by people in the suburbs--as opposed, let's say, to twenty years ago?

Yes, I think that the privatized God, who saves me and gets me to heaven, has pretty well evaporated [[especially in exurbia, the far suburbs]], and for those old private values people in the suburbs are more inclined to go to psychotherapists and/or neighbors than to priests, ministers, and rabbis. But the great thrust in the Bible--God as the God of truth, authenticity, reality, honesty, all these great words now so common in the youth culture, God as the God of truth and justice--this God who makes demand on us for emotional honesty (a goal of the sensitivity movement) and for social honesty in relation to minorities--this God who demands that we treat our neighbor with love out of love for God and for life itself, this God I would say is stronger now than, say, in the 1950s. It's the same God, the biblical God, but now we're more inclined to see him as the God who is concerned about mankind as well as the individual, justice as well as love.

What has increased this strength? Is there anything that has brought this about that can be identified?

Yes: young people! Just recently I was talking with Herman Kahn, founder and director of the Hudson Institute, and asked him why he is more and more concerned about values in relation to his computers. He laughed and said "My children! They won't let me any longer deal with our technocratic civilization in wholly value-free, comensurable, computerizable realities: I must take into consideration the realm of feelings." I too laughed and said, "You know, Herman, the story, at the beginning of the Bible,

about Adam and Eve naming the animals in response to God's command. Just now we're getting clobbered with this story by ecology crusaders, who accuse the Bible, because of its commands to name and subdue, of being the root of Western man's pollution of the globe, as though the Bible were a handbook for robber barons and chauvinists! But there's some truth in the accusation. Now, naming the animals is what the Hudson Institute has been doing, along with other think tanks: naming the animals and all their parts and all the parts of their parts and extensions, cells, molecules, atoms, subatomic particles. What we need now to recover is the two questions that lie behind the commands to name and subdue. The first is Do you love the animals you've named? It's true that if you only name them and don't love them, you pollute the earth: that's clear in your statement of reverence for the environment on the last page of your THE YEAR 2000. It's no longer optional whether we love nature or throw the ecosystems irreversibly out of balance, unless we hold our survival to be optional. And the second question from God is Do you love *me* through the animals? Do we love God through the whole of the creation--or, if one prefers not to use the religious term "God," one can shape the question Do you affirm life itself?--as Albert Schweitzer was doing in his great phrase 'reverence for life.' It's now a single package. Americans have become masters of the physical world, naming all the animals. Now our own young people are saying But do you love the animals? And at the next stage I think we're going to hear God say Do you love me through the animals? and then we'll be right back on the great biblical trip, viz. the praise of God and the joy of the whole creation."

Thank you very much. We've been talking with....This is Mike Moss. Good night.