

There has been almost nothing in the so many teachers. program dealing with the problems of those who are engaged in the enforcement of law. Hopefully, we will find ourselves exploring many new dimensions of vocationally related ethics in the years ahead.

10

Other Topics on the Programs

In the previous chapters each of the subject categories discussed was explored in quite a large group of papers. This chapter considers several issues with which a smaller number of papers wrestle, issues that are nevertheless frequently of key importance. It also discusses the attention given in the programs to the teaching of ethics.

Specific Discussions of Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox Traditions

Starting as a group with a mainly Protestant orientation, the Society was somewhat slow to pay attention to the contributions of other traditions, even to the traditions which have the same biblical roots as Protestant Christianity. For instance, while the Hebraic heritage of Christianity had always been presupposed, it was only the prompting of a special task force, which was formed late in the period being canvassed by this study, that led the Society to give serious attention to the ways in which Jewish ethical thinking has developed alongside the growth of Christian reflection. Likewise, while the common heritage of Protestant and Catholic in the pre-Reformation experience of the church was tacitly assumed, it has only been in the last dozen years that the Society's programs have paid conscious attention to the further development of the Roman Catholic moral tradition as a distinctive entity. Eastern Orthodoxy came to be looked at only in the past few years.

when two papers have focused on ethics in that tradition. 1) Jewish Ethics. Ten years after the Society was founded, Charles Kegley gave a paper on "Martin Buber and the Problem of Norms." Kegley identified many Protestant-like elements in the thinking of this Jewish thinker, and suggested that Buber placed a strong emphasis on the relational aspects of ethical decision-making. For Buber, the meaning of the good is integrally related to the will of God, and abstract systems or principles have no place in ethics. But, argued Kegley, Buber's thinking makes a place

for other emphases, such as a Kantian concept of the Absolute--which keeps his ethic from becoming purely situational. According to Kegley, Buber recognized that what are assumed to be divine commands have to be evaluated for legitimacy, and that moral choice cannot be purely arbitrary. Kegley's analysis concluded by noting how Buber's thinking takes due account of the ambiguity involved in ethical decision-making, steering between the Scylla of absolutism and the Charybdis of relativism. After giving his paper before the Society, Kegley published an article entitled "Martin Buber's Ethics and the Problem of Norms," in *Religious Studies* 5, (December 1969): 181-94.

It was six more years before specific attention was again directed to Jewish ethics. In 1975 Sid Z. Leiman gave a paper entitled "The Sinking of the William Brown: A Case Study in Jewish Ethics." This paper examined the moral issues raised by the case of William Brown (whose life boat contained more passengers than it could safely hold). Leiman contrasted the American legal approach to deciding who should be cast overboard, as seen in the adjudication of the case in courts, with how classical Jewish teaching would have approached the same case. Two years later, Robert Willis gave a paper, "Barth, Bonhoeffer, and Jewish Suffering: Reflections on the Relationship Between Theology, Conscience and Moral Action."

In 1979 the task force on Jewish and Christian ethics was becoming active and there was also a growing hope that the membership of the Society might be widened to include a larger number of Jewish scholars. There was a proposal at the time (discussed in the next chapter) to change the name of the Society to The Society of Religious Ethics. In the spirit of that situation Franklin Sherman presented a paper on "Messianism, Mysticism, and the Mitzvot: Reflection on the Relation of Jewish and Christian Ethics." His paper, which was chosen for inclusion in *The Selected Papers*, indicated that Jewish ethics can be divided into three types: a "social" type, embodied in messianism; a "dispositional" type embodied in Jewish mysticism; and a "concrete commandment" type as reflected in obedience to the mitzvot. The following year Marvin Fox discussed "Contemporary Trends in Jewish Ethics," and his paper was also published in *The Selected Papers*. In its published form, Fox's paper was entitled "Reflections on the Foundations of Jewish Ethics and Their Relation to Public Policy." It notes that much philosophical work remains to be done in articulating Jewish ethics, and shows--by suggesting how various Jewish teachers have dealt in quite divergent ways with particular problems--how much variation is encountered in Jewish thinking. According to Fox, Jewish scholars differ on theoretical

questions such as the cognitive foundation of ethics, the proper justification of norms and the relationship of law and morality. Jewish ethicists also come to different positions on questions of public policy, even though they generally teach that government should be just and that the state must not override the commandment of God. Hence, they work under the same limitations as Christian ethicists, and their witness as spokespersons for their tradition is affected by the same problems as face Christian ethicists.

In 1981, Ronald Green's paper, "The Korah Episode: A Rationalist Reappraisal of Rabbinic Anti-Rationalism," which was published in *The Annual*, examined the problem of revelation and reason as found in Jewish ethics. Noting the argument as to whether or not Jewish ethics support the idea of rational autonomy in the moral life, Green cited Midrashic and Talmudic commentary on the argument over the authority of Moses found in the Korah episode in Numbers 16. Holding that the crucial issue is not whether a given religious tradition openly acknowledges the supremacy of reason, but "whether its own revealed sources of authority do or do not invariably support rationally defensible moral conduct," Green concluded that the Jewish treatment of the Korah incident suggests that a rapprochement is possible between a religious tradition that relies on revelation for its authority and a rationalism that looks at the basic fabric of a religious heritage in order to sense the role of reasoning in the complex and sophisticated dimensions of its beliefs.

In 1980 Sumner B. Twiss and David A. Wiener gave a paper on "Moral Responsibility in Mishnah," and Wayne G. Boulton, a paper on "Jewish Christian Ethics in the 80's: A Constructive Statement." Boulton's paper was addressed to Christians on the American right wing, calling them to acknowledge their indebtedness to Judaism more candidly and to accept social responsibility within the larger family of communities whose life is patterned on law. Presenting a model of Jewish Christian ethics inspired by the ethos of the Hillel order of the Pharisees, Boulton showed how this model was affected by the concept of covenant as a vertical dimension and by "constitutionalism" as a horizontal dimension. Its breadth provided an effective means of counter-acting anti-Judaism both inside and outside of the Christian community.

Two papers dealing with the holocaust may be mentioned in connection with Jewish ethics even though they focus more on a Jewish related question than on the specific nature of Jewish ethics as such. One of these was given in 1981 by John T. Pawlikowski and was entitled "The Holocaust: Its Implications for Public Morality." The other, in 1983, by

Hans O. Tiefel, was on "Rethinking Christian Ethics in Light of the Holocaust." Both of these papers are in the archives. Pawlikowski authored an article, "The Holocaust: Its Implications for the Church and Society Problematic," *Encounter* 42, (Spring 1981): 143-54. Both writers were equally disturbed by the Holocaust and anxious to avoid any repetition of its horror. But they had somewhat different explanations for why it took place. Pawlikowski argued that the holocaust was related to the rise of aggressive secularism which eclipsed the dimension of transcendence from public consciousness. He suggested the importance of recapturing a religious criticism over the human enterprise. Tiefel charged that the churches were silent partners or tacit accomplices in the horror and were unwilling to speak in defense of the Jews. Back of this unwillingness, argued Tiefel, was a tacit theological anti-Semitism. The culture also contributed to the problem because it set the stage for a detached professionalism which isolated certain kinds of human activity from moral scrutiny. Both of these causes, he suggested, arose out of a culture shaped by the dualistic social ethic of German Protestantism. Using this diagnosis, Tiefel called for a strategy that places public life under the continual scrutiny of religious faith and that recognizes the common Lordship of God over both Israel and the church.

2) Roman Catholic Moral Theology. The discussion of the Roman Catholic heritage as a specific tradition began at the 1972 meeting. At that meeting Warren Reich gave a paper on "The Unity of Personal and Social Ethics in the Theology of Karl Rahner," (which cannot be located). Charles Curran, in a presidential address, examined "Catholic Ethics Today in Light of the Dialogue with Protestant Ethics." In his address Curran examined post-Vatican II changes in Roman Catholic moral theology taking place as a result of the emerging dialogue between Catholics and Protestants. He took issue with the distinctions drawn between the thinking of the two groups developed in Roger Mehl's book *Catholic Ethics and Protestant Ethics*, arguing that Mehl over emphasized the differences between the two traditions. According to Curran, Roman Catholic moral theology had been engaged in a far more thorough critique of its own natural law heritage than Mehl had indicated--a critique that brought it closer to Protestant ways of doing ethics than commonly realized, and which provided it with a plurality of methodologies to replace the codified tradition in the moral theology handbooks of the triumphalist period.

According to Curran, the role of the teaching authority of the Church had been undergoing reconceptualization. For instance, many moral theologians were arguing that on

certain matters papal authority could be considered provisional rather than infallible. This development was resulting in an increasing pluralism in the Church. Finally, changes in theological presuppositions of Catholic thinking were modifying the nature/supernature issue and making the Church's position nearer to one of Christ transforming culture than of Christ above culture. Roman Catholic thinking was also shifting, argued Curran, in ways that made it impossible to stress sanctification to the exclusion of justification, or order at the expense of freedom. Curran noted that Protestant ethicists, the Roman Catholic community in general, and even the bishops and members of the hierarchical teaching office of the Roman church herself had often been unaware of these changes in the thinking of moral theologians.

In 1976, James M. Gustafson gave a paper entitled "Overcoming Differences in Catholic and Protestant Ethics." This paper shared with the Society work in progress toward the publication of his book *Protestant and Roman Catholic Ethics* (University of Chicago Press, 1978).

3) Eastern Orthodoxy. This was the last specific tradition to be discussed. In 1977 Stanley Harakas delivered a paper, "Natural Law in Christian Ethics: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective." This was published, under a slightly modified title, in *The Selected Papers*. Harakas has further developed his materials and published a book, *Toward Transfigured Life: The Theoria of Eastern Orthodox Ethics* (Light and Life Publishing Company, 1983). In the paper before the Society, Harakas pointed out that Eastern Orthodox thinking has always made a place for natural law, but has given it only casual attention. In natural law thinking in the Eastern tradition, equity is an important consideration--a fact that gives natural law in that tradition an important social import. The natural law is connected with the teaching of the Decalogue--although the Decalogue is seen as but a limited aspect of Christian morality. The commandments are important, but are understood in connection with a larger sense of God's being, will, and purpose.

A paper by Vigen Guorian in 1983, "Notes Toward an Eastern Orthodox Ethics," pointed out that Eastern theology moves in an experiential and practical way from a discussion of virtue to reflection on the nature of love, and from reflection on love to the exploration of mystical union with God. Eastern Orthodoxy has not accorded ethics the independence from theology it tends to have in Protestantism, nevertheless it has been rigorously systematic in its approach. Furthermore, it has stressed *theosis* (conforming to the nature of God) and love as cardinal concepts. It sees the Incarnation

as making something close to the imitation of Christ important for the Christian life—but does so without the Pelagian rationalism that is often associated with the concept of imitation of Christ in Western understandings. Eastern thinking disagrees with all utilitarian, deontological, or teleological ethics which treat the world with either a utilitarian or rational calculus. For Eastern thought the goal of ethics is to achieve salvation as one-ness with God.

Excursion into Comparative Religious Ethics

Just as the Society broadened its scope of inquiry to include Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox traditions, so to a lesser extent it has examined ethical reflection in other faith traditions. Five papers and one panel in programs of the Society have examined ethics in the non-Western world.

In 1966 two papers were focused on such concerns. "Pushing Back the Inscrutable: Research in Religion and Social Change in Hindu and Buddhist Ethics" was the title of a presentation by Bardwell Smith. He was working on these issues at the time and some months later published an article, "Toward a Buddhist Anthropology: The Problem of the Secular," in *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 36, (September 1968): 203-16. Robert E. Lee's paper "Stranger in the Land: Ethical Speculation in Japan," given the same year, was later used as the basis of an article "Obstacles to Church Growth," in *Theology Today* 32, (April 1966): 73-87.

Five years later, a major plenary session was devoted to "Ethics in the Non-Western World." Rubem Alves, then teaching at Union Seminary in New York but speaking from a South American orientation, discussed the "Crisis of Imagination in Western Ethics." J. Deotis Roberts of Howard University explored "African Religions and African Social Consciousness." Hideo Hashimoto of Lewis and Clark College examined the "Renewal of Buddhism in Japan: Moral and Political Significance." Hashimoto's paper survives in a blue dittoed form in the archives in a version more extensive than could have been presented on the program. The paper examines the feelings of desecration, emptiness, despair and defeat in Japan following the end of the Second World War, and looks at the conditions that gave rise to new religious groups, particularly the movement known as Nichiren Shoshu Sokagakkai. Many of the observations made by Hashimoto resemble the kind of analysis a sociologist would make of a new sect, but he did include observations about the basic ethical stance of the new group. Hashimoto saw the movement as a kind of "situation ethics" carried to the extreme. He

noted how the movement embraced contradictory elements even without holding them in dialectical tension. The will of the leader, whatever form it takes, is decisive. The organization expects unquestioning obedience and in return provides a strong sense of belonging. The movement, in emphasizing the importance of work, has features similar to the protestant ethic, but has nothing akin to the Protestant principle, which enables a group to criticize its own life from within. It has no sense of guilt, sin, or grace.

It was another five years before the program of the Society again contained a presentation on non-Christian traditions. In 1976 Roderick Hindery presented "Ethics in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism: Some Methodological Questions." Hindery had given considerable attention to these matters and the same year in which he delivered this paper before the Society he published "Hindu Ethics in the Ramayana" in *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 4 (Fall 1976): 287-322. In 1982 George L. Frear contributed to cross-cultural understandings with a paper entitled "The Iroquois Experience of Good and Evil." Frear outlined the creation stories of the Iroquois tribe, in which twin deities function, and he examined the dualistic assumptions in the tribe's healing practices. He showed how later changes in Iroquois ritual modified the dualism of the creation myth, but commended Iroquois thinking generally for taking very seriously the possibility that evil is, to use a phrase from Paul Ricoeur, "an original element of being." The last paper dealing with ethics in another religious tradition was delivered in 1983, when Frederick S. Carney examined "Obligation and Virtue in Islamic and Western Ethics."

Ethics and Liturgy

In the first section of this history we indicated that there was much vacillating in program planning about the inclusion of worship as part of the regularly scheduled activities of the annual meeting. Whatever the ambivalence about holding services of worship, there has been no question about having occasional sessions of the program deal with the relationship between ethics and liturgy. There have been a number of such discussions, but they did not begin to appear on the program of the Society until well into the second decade of its life.

In 1972 a panel consisting of Richard Davis, Paul Elman, and William Everett discussed the relationship between "The Cultic and the Political." Everett's contribution to the panel was published in *The Anglican Theological Review* 56 (January 1974): 16-34, under the title, "Liturgy and American Society: An Invocation for Ethical Analysis." With bold and broad strokes Everett examined the role played by

liturgy in civic religion, in the sports programs of universities, and in movements for wide-spread cultural and social change. Everett found a key relationship to exist between ritual and the legitimization of authority, and noted that the presence of liturgical kinds of behavior in so many areas of public life had consequences for the churches. Roman Catholics, in whose tradition liturgical reform started in the late nineteenth century as an effort to recover the sources of liturgical practice, have moved increasingly to celebrations related to issues of peace and justice. Protestants, whose worship has often been an expression of the thrust toward self-control over the decisions of life, have frequently discovered liturgical meaning in the struggle for social justice. In the future, suggested Everett, there will be even more interchange between the worship of the churches and their social environment. Both students of ethics and students of liturgy must become more aware of the various patterns in which people exercise their social roles--patterns having both liturgical and ethical meaning.

At the 1978 meeting Paul M. Harrison gave a paper with the title: "Dramaturgy and Ethics." Harrison had just published an essay entitled "Toward a Dramaturgical Interpretation of Religion," *Sociological Analysis* 38 (Winter 1977): 389-396, which drew attention to theatricality and drama-turgy as modes of interpreting religious behavior. While his paper as delivered before the Society is not available, Harrison shared with this writer a mimeographed article from which he developed from it, entitled "A Dramaturgical Interpretation of Theological Ethics." Harrison's paper raised issues on the boundary line between ethics and liturgics. According to Harrison, the dramaturgical looks carefully at a process in which virtues and habits are developed in shared interactional situations, and thus has insights that may contribute to a profounder understanding of ethics--particularly of those ways of doing ethics that emphasize the role of story, the place of character, and the importance of interactional relationships in the making of decisions. Admittedly, Harrison was less directly concerned for liturgy in the specific sense of religious worship or civic ceremony than Everett, but his paper did indicate how the dramas of public life interrelate to social values and the appeal which those values have to the public. He concluded that the doing of ethics cannot be merely a dispassionate, non-theatrical, publicly rational exercise, but must see how people are involved in moral dramas. All modes of drama have implications for morality and ethics, not merely (as many ethicists have supposed) the mode of tragedy.

Considerable attention was given to the relationship

between ethics and liturgy at the 1979 meeting, when a plenary session was devoted to a discussion of this topic. Paul Ramsey was asked to address the subject on a panel with Donald Salliers, who teaches worship at the Candler School of Theology in Atlanta. Margaret Farley responded. All three parts of this session were published in the Fall 1979 issue of *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, along with additional responses later prepared by William Everett and Philip J. Rossi. In his presentation, Ramsey examined how both liturgy and morality refer to the divine events to which faith also testifies and argued that an ethicist's understanding of morality is diminished without a grasp of the content of liturgy and the rule of faith. Examining the role of liturgy in relation to the practice of marriage, Ramsey explored with some care the practice of Eastern Orthodox churches in using a special (and different) liturgy for the marriage of divorced persons than it uses for the first marriage of partners. The ritual for a marriage of divorced parties contains an explicit acknowledgement of shortcoming and failure--an emphasis that Ramsey finds salutary in its witness to the essential indissolubility of the marriage bond. Contrasting the realism of the Eastern Orthodox ritual with the sentimentality of a liturgy remembered from the days of his participation in Youth Fellowship, Ramsey made some telling points about his belief in the importance of structure and fidelity in marriage.

In his presentation, Donald Salliers focused on the role of liturgy in the formation of the moral agent. He stressed the corporate nature of worship as an experience which shapes character. He looked at four modalities of corporate prayer--thanksgiving, anamnesis, confession and intercession--and the role which is played by each in Christian development. While explicitly repudiating any reduction of worship to a merely instrumental significance in shaping the moral agent, Salliers showed how the worship of God can call forth obedience to the Gospel and maintain prophetic self-awareness in a world of moral ambiguity. Salliers urged ethicists to pay more attention to the role of liturgy in the shaping of those communities in which decisions are made and carried out. He also urged liturgists to be more astute in considering how their efforts can nurture the affections and virtues requisite for the moral life.

Margaret Farley emphasized that the failure and impoverishment of contemporary worship may well stem from the ethical shortcomings in the church--injustice in its life disagreement as to the importance and the nature of these virtues that should be rendered to the world, and a breakdown of the symbols which point to inclusion and justice for all. She suggested that worship will become rich and meaningful

only as the ethical roots of community are reconstructed.

In 1983 Richard Bondi considered "Christian Ethics and the Formation of Character: The Role of the Sermon." Setting his discussion in an overview of the ethics of character and virtue, and noting the importance of hearing the story as a factor in the formation of character, Bondi examined where and how the Christian story is told. He identified six places: scripture; church history; ritual; preaching; the transmission and editing of Christian thought; and the lives and witness of present-day Christians. The sermon, which most directly implements the fourth of these ways, renders the images, symbols, and implications of the story available to the hearts of a particular congregation. Drawing on the several principles of narrative preaching set forth in the work of Professor F. B. Craddock, he examined the promise and danger in a narrative style of preaching and indicated ways in which the ethicist can serve a useful function by acting as editor (and not merely as recounter) of the story.

Papers and Programs Dealing with the Ethics of Sex

In the first twenty-five years of the Society's history the ethics of sexual behavior have been dealt with eleven times on the programs of the annual meetings. All of these occasions have occurred in the last fifteen years. The archives do not have a very complete record of the various presentations, but some trends can be traced from what is available.

In 1968 Paul Ramsey moderated a plenary session on "Changing Sex Ethics and Value Patterns in the Modern World." Bernard Häring, serving at the time as a Visiting Professor at Union Theological Seminary, gave the paper and George Easter responded. Häring's paper is not available. Easter's response—which is a substantive discussion in its own right—explored a situational understanding of sexual morality. Referring to Häring's book, *The Law of Christ*, Easter noted how Häring moves directly from a discussion of responsibility to an exposition of normative patterns. Easter questioned whether such a move is licit, and argued that a strong situationalism (in which future behavior is not necessarily guided by past experience) would provide a more satisfactory approach, since openness to the new and to the unexpected constitute an important aspect of sexual fulfillment.

Seven years later, in 1975, Margaret Farley presented a paper on "Sexuality and Sexual Identity," with John H. McNeill and Robert Beene responding. The next year John Giles Milhaven's topic was, "Christian Evaluations of Sexual Pleasure." His paper is found in *The Selected Papers* 1976.

Milhaven's paper reflected materials earlier documented and explained in an article in *Theological Studies* 35 (December, 1974: 692-710). He outlined four different evaluations of sexual pleasure given in Christian thought. In one of these, the pleasure is acknowledged to be good but is deemed as something that should be sought only in conjunction with the desire to procreate; in another the desire for pleasure is considered an essential aspect of the relationship and is to be sought for its value in enhancing the conjugal relationship; in a third the pleasure is accepted as legitimate but not considered the essential quality of the relation between partners; and in the fourth the pleasure is considered foul and evil. Even though the fourth position looks at sexual pleasure as something that needs to be forgiven and should never be sought as an end in itself, it treats sex as something that may be used by God in the furtherance of His purposes in creating new souls. Several months after delivering his paper before the Society, Milhaven published "Thomas Aquinas on Sexual Pleasure," *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 5 (Fall, 1977): 7-58.

In 1977 Beverly Harrison, joined with her husband, James Harrison, in preparing a paper entitled "Normative Problems in Family Ethics," which was published in *The Selected Papers* under the title "Some Problems for Normative Christian Family Ethics." In this paper, delivered by Beverly Harrison, certain reservations are expressed about traditional Christian teaching about marriage. The paper emphasizes a belief that marriage should be thought of as a relational life process more than as a particular status bestowed by civil or religious authority, and that the quality of interpersonal relations rather than the existence of a particular institutionalized status should be of primary concern. Charging that marriage as an institution is "being asked to bear the burden of compensation for depersonalizing, alienating life elsewhere in society," the paper contends that there is a pervasive need to cultivate capacities of intimacy that are free of manipulation and coercion.

"The Duty to Desire: Love, Friendship, and Sexuality in Some Puritan Theories of Marriage," is the title of a paper given by Edmund Leites at the 1980 meeting. This paper was published in *The Comparative Civilization Review* (Fall 1979): 40-82. In this paper Leites shows that the Puritan notion of conjugal love was one which held that "an outward fulfillment of the duties of marriage was not enough; the proper intention and feelings toward your spouse also had to exist." Leites's paper suggests that the Puritans did sense the importance of some of the very qualities the Harrisons were upholding, and it also hints at some of the reasons the Puritan ethos was not as successful as it could have been in

providing spouses with the means to attain the qualities of interaction which it held up as the ideal.

At the 1981 meeting, Wilson Yates gave a paper on "the Family and Power: Towards an Ethic of Family Social Responsibility." This paper appears in *The 1981 Annual*. Yates focused attention on the family as a unit of power in society, and urged Christian ethicists to consider the social responsibilities incumbent on families in the exercise of their power. Perhaps this paper should be mentioned under another rubric---such as political ethics---since it was much concerned with how the family functions as a unit of social influence in the political and economic order. It had relatively little to say about sexual morality in the usual sense of that term, but it does prompt us to wonder how participation in external power configurations affects intimate relationships. Another paper at the 1981 meetings, by Roger B. Betworth, given at the meeting under the title "Sexual Values, 1980," and found in the archives under the title "Sexual Responsibility: An Analysis of Mutuality," examines the ideal of mutuality found in the writings of Masters and Johnson and argues that the ideal cannot sustain itself in contemporary culture. Betworth argued that only as a couple copes with experiences of betrayal and goes beyond competitive manipulation will it be able to sustain the marriage relationship. This involves reversing the ordinary logic of equivalency and reciprocal mutuality and finding a grace that heals experiences of suffering and tragedy.

In 1982 Carl A. Raschke gave a paper on "Homosexuality and the Construction of Christian Ethics." The same year, James E. Allen of the School of Public Health, gave a paper on "Women's Challenge to Christian Ethics: Notions of the Family." The subtitle of Allen's paper was "Why the Women's Movement Challenges Basic Assumptions in Western Christian Ethics about the Functions of the Family, Reproduction, and Work."

Two sessions dealing with sexual morality were on the program of the twenty-fourth annual meeting in 1983. David F. Kelley gave a paper on "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine." Drawing together certain texts of Augustine and analyzing Augustine's teaching about sex in the context of those passages, this paper argues that while Augustine explicitly intended to teach for human kind, to help his readers and hearers live more fully, and to further the beauty of Christian married life, his understanding of the act of sexual pleasure and desire in carnal concupiscence did not achieve that result because it tainted human sexuality with implications of evil and corruption. This paper was published in *The Annual*. The second session dealing with this topic at the 1983 meeting was a panel on the teaching of

sexual ethics. This panel was chaired by James B. Neilson, and Robert W. Blaney, Christine Gudorf, John Giles Milhaven, and Jane Cary Peck were participants.

Higher Education

The great majority of the members of the Society are involved in some form of higher education. Yet, in only five papers, concentrated in two programs of the Society, has attention been directed to higher education and the ethical issues that arise in either pedagogy or governance. Perhaps higher education is relatively free of moral problems; perhaps it is easier to speculate how to resolve the problems of others than to resolve our own; perhaps it cuts too close to the tender quick when directing attention to things so near home.

The 1968 meeting had three papers dealing with problems of higher education. This was the time of campus ferment and that may explain the sudden and isolated concentration of attention to this subject at that meeting. Two of these papers were part of a panel entitled "Power and Dissent in Educational Institutions." Louis Joughlin of the American Association of University Professors spoke on "Institutional Identities and Purposes," and Samuel H. Magill, on "Academic Freedom and Participation." Magill argued that academic freedom involves three dimensions: 1) the right of the teacher-scholar to pursue truth wherever it might lead and to profess understandings of that truth according to the best possible judgment that can be mustered; 2) the right of students (and faculty) to hear speakers from a wide spectrum of viewpoints and to enjoy "due process" in how they are treated under institutional policies; and 3) the right of a community of scholars to articulate its own goals and to define its own norms and priorities. Magill contrasted the "law of the jungle"---which governs where redress of grievances is not possible through rational and legal means---with the ideal of the university as a place which upholds a principle of adjudicating claims on the basis of merit. He asked how much politics by confrontation constitute a threat to the university's *raison de être*. He looked at hierarchical, negotiational, and participatory models of governance, and examined the reasons why the participatory model has not worked as effectively in practice as ideally might be expected. He concluded that only when all of the constituents of the university share a commitment to some common center of values, know how to communicate with each other about those shared values, and are required to exercise power under restraints that make them responsible to all the other constituencies in appropriate ways, will institutional governance have the quality it ought to have.

At the same meeting Robert E. Fitch overwiewed "Changing Student Roles and Expectations." He found five different attitudinal groups with which it is possible to identify, and listed five "gaps" that exist between those groups on the campus. He set up a spectrum with "hippies," at one end and "hoodlums" at the other. He criticized the "hippies" as largely hypocritical and the "hoodlums" as threats to the civility of the university. He suggested the central majority of the student citizens of the academic world are quite uninterested in being involved in either of these extremes.

In 1975, the only other annual meeting to consider ethical issues of higher education, C. Freeman Sleeper gave a paper on "College as a Moral Community." He identified the areas of moral concern on campus, examined the broader social trends which impinge on college life, and noted how moral choices are forced on the college by both external influences and internal pressures. According to Sleeper, colleges will only be able to handle the moral issues confronting them as they define what it means to be a moral community. The other paper in 1975 was given by Edward J. Long, Jr. on "Credibility in Campus Governance." Long argued that educational institutions must govern themselves according to some agreed upon goals and purposes and that they must rely almost completely on persuasion in the making of decisions. They cannot rely upon the exercise of power as the main instrument of governance. To embrace power as a means of deciding issues invites those with more power who wish to interfere with the university's affairs to ignore the openness which the university cherishes. None of the papers discussed in this section has ever been published.

Papers and Programs Dealing with the Teaching of Ethics and the Role of Ethicists in Academia and the Church

One of the original reasons for bringing together teachers of Christian ethics was to exchange ideas about teaching the field and to talk together about professional responsibilities in school, in church, and in society. The presidential address of Das Kelley Barnett at the constituting meeting of the Society in 1959 was devoted largely to trying to define the nature of Christian ethics as a discipline. It also pointed to the need to exchange ideas about teaching and the professional roles of the Christian ethicist. (Copies of that address have not been found in the research done for this history, but there have been several recollections of it made by those who were present at the founding meeting.)

A long series of papers, panels, and workshops dealing with these matters has taken place in subsequent years. In all but nine of the twenty-five years of the Society's history there has been at least one, and in one year as many

as three, parts of the program devoted to the discussion of how to teach the field. In the second year of the Society's history, almost the entire program was devoted to a discussion of pedagogical aspects of the profession. Indeed, the only other item on the agenda of that meeting was an address by Reinhold Niebuhr. In the next year, 1961, a session on the case method in the teaching of Christian ethics was planned, though it seems to have been cancelled because the scheduled speaker was unable to get there. (See chapter one for additional details on these two meetings).

The presidential address of E. Clinton Gardner in 1962 was on "The Church and Its Social Witness." Gardner applied the typology in H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture* to the relationship of the church to society. He proposed a model for the contemporary witness of the church that incorporates elements of both the dualist and the transformationalist types. He took the transformation of society as the goal of the church, but noted that since this transformation is never complete, the strategy of the church must include maintaining the eschatological tension between the Gospel and the culture. The following year, Kenneth Smith delivered a paper on "The Churches and the Sociology of the Future."

There are two other papers in the archives of the 1963 meeting that deal with matters germane to this rubric. Thomas Oden reported on his experiment with the use of research and dialogue teams in teaching. He noted the sociological context of his teaching---a context dominated by a cultural Protestantism which either prompted withdrawal from the realm of political affairs or sanctioned the absorption of the culture's values by the church. To counteract the mind-set of such culture-Protestantism, Oden set up teams of students who undertook to dialogue, not only with each other about the reading assignments, but with the local community about its problems and conditions. His paper reported on the results of the experiment, utilizing information gathered from questionnaires returned by class members at the conclusion of the course. This paper provides a detailed account of an unusual way of teaching. In the program for the same year, George D. Younger examined an action/research project on juvenile delinquency conducted on the lower East side of Manhattan. In addition to reporting on what was actually done, Younger examined several theoretical issues being addressed in social work circles and the possible connection between those issues and the problems that ought to be raised by the Christian social ethicist.

In 1966, under the leadership of Joseph Fletcher, and again in 1969, under the leadership of Henry B. Clark and

Donald W. Shriver, Jr., attention was directed at the use of the case method for the teaching of Christian social ethics. Fletcher's presentation reflected the then popular status of the situation ethics approach. Clark had conducted a survey among members of the Society concerning their teaching methods and gave a written report based on replies from some twenty-six members of the Society, twenty of whom used the case method in teaching. Some of those who replied indicated that they used the case method for entire courses; others interspersed case method teaching with other techniques. A catalog of the values and dangers in using the method was included in Clark's report. Donald Shriver compiled a four-page list of pertinent resources, including theoretical discussion of cases, analytical treatments of the method's value, instruction in the use of the method, game theory, and a list of individuals using these techniques and willing to be contacted for further information about them.

The case method for teaching social ethics is as old as the discipline, having been used by Francis Greenwood Peabody in the 1880s in his course at Harvard which initiated the discipline in America. But the lure of the case method in the Society's life was possibly felt most strongly in the heyday of situationalism. In 1974 there was yet another panel on "The Use of the Case-Study Approach," in which Keith Bridston, Frederick Carney, George Crowell, Donald Shriver, and J. Philip Wogaman participated. The panel was scheduled right after the annual banquet (which at that point in the Society's history was a relatively unused hour) and consisted of informal sharing between panel members and the audience about their experiences with this way of teaching. The case study method had also figured prominently in the paper delivered by Keith Bridston in 1974 discussed in chapter nine.

Meanwhile, other aspects of the teaching of ethics were considered in program presentations. In 1970 there was a panel entitled "Training Agents for Social Change." Sister Martin de Fores Gray and Albert Sampson made presentations which have not been found. The presentation by a third panelist, George Crowell, is available. It focused particularly on ways in which we can train students to work actively to eliminate evils such as racism from the social order. Crowell expressed his concern that the theoretical instruction we usually provide does little to prepare students to undertake social action, and described an interdisciplinary program for teaching the skills of social action being instituted at the University of Windsor. While the program was designed to concentrate on the study of social action, thus preparing people for more active roles in their

communities, it would not require students to participate in any particular cause. Over a decade later, in 1981, George Younger gave a paper, "Action Training: A Contribution to the Church's Witness in Modern Society," which reported on some experiments he was conducting at the time.

In 1973 a workshop of the teaching of ethics was arranged by Frederick Carney. Four members of the Society--Joseph L. Allen, Charles C. West, Charles Reynolds, and Daniel C. Maguire--participated. Each of them answered these two questions: "What am I doing in the teaching of ethics?" and "How do I think this can best be achieved?" The responses were mimeographed and distributed to members of the Society, and are in that form in the archives. The persons on this panel were teaching in quite different schools and even in quite different contexts, so there was some breadth to the answers which they gave. Even so, some of the problems they encountered in their work seem to be common to all the settings in which they worked. Maguire's presentation included a kind of pie chart of the type that would soon thereafter appear in his book *The Moral Choice* (Doubleday, 1978).

Game theory, rather than the case method, provided the framework of two other programs dealing with the teaching of ethics. In 1975 Thomas R. McFall, Robert Mansbach, Harry L. Smith, and Robert W. Terry led a workshop called, "Teaching through Simulation Games." In 1977 Ronald Green gave a paper on "A Game for the Teaching of Ethics." As yet unpublished, Green's paper describes the use of the game for demonstrating to a class of students the difficulties of making choices in social situations.

There have also been sessions devoted to the problems of teaching about specific issues. In 1977 Darell Reeck gave a paper on "Teaching Ethics on Global Issues." His paper included an analysis of *Limits of Growth* by Meadows and Meadows, and showed how, by using contrasting models, the place of assumption as well as the significance of empirical elements in a decision could be demonstrated. Mention has already been made of the panel on the teaching of sexual ethics that was held in 1983.

Along with the papers dealing with the teaching of Christian ethics, other papers have considered the professional vocation of the Christian ethicist outside of the purely academic role. In 1977, Dieter T. Hessel looked at "Solidarity Ethics: A Public Focus for the Church." In his paper Hessel criticized both the churches and the Christian ethicists for their failure to be more concerned with urgent policy questions and concrete forms of the struggle for social justice. He suggested that taking the idea of solidarity between peoples as a central key for the doing of

ethics would help ethics to relate to where the law is lived, where justice is done, where love is expressed, and where community is reinforced. This is one of the few papers given before the Society over the years dealing with pedagogical issues or professional concerns that has been published. It appears in *The Selected Papers 1977*.

Certain other papers have been directed to even broader aspects of the professional role of the Christian ethicist. Two other presentations, both given in 1979, deserve mention. Karen Lebacqz, Carl Marbury, and Howard Hills discussed "Professional Ethicists in Non-academic Roles" at that meeting. Edward L. Long, Jr., in a special afternoon session, helped to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Society with a preliminary account of its history, and at that time made a promise to prepare a longer version in connection with the twenty-fifth anniversary.

This concludes the account of the programs of the Society--programs that have examined an enormous range of issues in a great variety of ways to the edification of a large proportion of those who are actively engaged in the teaching of Christian ethics in the United States and Canada. The last section of this history will reflect on the significance of the Society's achievements and on its prospects for the future.

Part Four Analysis

The analysis section of the history is divided into four parts. The first part, "The Society's History," traces the Society's development from its founding in 1959 to the present. It discusses the Society's early years, its growth, and its current status. The second part, "The Society's Mission," discusses the Society's purpose and its commitment to the teaching of Christian ethics. The third part, "The Society's Programs," discusses the Society's various programs and activities. The fourth part, "The Society's Future," discusses the Society's prospects for the future.