theological
bulletin

mc master divinity college
hamilton   ontario

The New Counter Culture of Alienated Youth
REVIVAL, REVOLUTION, OR HISTORICAL REPLAY

G. P. Albaugh

Editorial

The writer of the present issue of the Bulletin will hardly need an introduction to most of our readers. Professor G. P. Albaugh has taught church history for many years in the Divinity College and many of you have personally benefited from his wisdom, knowledge and counsel.

This year he is acting as President of the Canadian Church History Society and he will be delivering the substance of this piece of research to the meeting of the learned societies in Newfoundland later this summer.

He wishes me to state that he sees this present article as dealing with the subject previously announced — The Church-Moulder or Mirror of Culture. I think it will be generally agreed when you have read it that he has made a notable contribution to a contemporary problem in which we are all deeply interested and personally involved.

We are very grateful to him for opening up for us a difficult subject, and for many, a little explored one. It will help us all to grapple with the difficult task confronting the contemporary church as to how far it should mould or mirror the culture in which we must all live out our Christian lives.

R. F. A.

THE NEW COUNTER CULTURE OF ALIENATED YOUTH
REVIVAL, REVOLUTION, OR HISTORICAL REPLAY

by

Gaylord P. Albaugh

In 1967 a new song began sweeping the rock circuit in the United States, the heart of its lyric running

All across the nation, such a strong vibration

There's a whole generation, with a new explanation[1].

This "whole generation with a new explanation" is more than a musical fantasy beamed at us by an eccentric bard to the south. It is a demographic fact both in the United States and Canada. In both countries an accelerated twentieth-century shift of population balance in favor of the young has brought the swing of the numerical pendulum to the nadir of the adult half of the arc and is about to set in motion the upward thrust toward the generation of youth.

According to 1969 statistics, the latest available in all categories where comparison is desired, the total populations of United States and Canada were respectively 203,213,000 and 21,061,000 persons. Of the United States total some 93,519,000 (46 per cent) of the enumerated were under 25 years of age — 20,518,000 aged 10-14; 18,438,000 aged 15-19; 15,776,000 aged 20-24; with 7,697,000 (mostly of the last two age groups, but some older) in pursuit of higher education in 2,374 universities. Of the Canadian total some 10,295,000 (49 per cent) of the enumerated were under 25 years of age — 2,254,000 aged 10-14; 2,015,000 aged 15-19; 1,761,000 aged 20-24; with 270,000 (mostly of the last two age groups, but some older) in pursuit of higher education in 155 universities.[2]

Particularly are the nearly 40,000,000 aged 15-24 making vibrations that are ruffling our North American calm. Mostly residents in or drop-outs from our massive secondary and university complexes, they are rebelling vocally and otherwise at what they have, or have chosen not, to endure. Not only this. We are reading daily of similar uprisings in various nations throughout the world which have traditionally been associated with the same western ethos against which our own young are rebelling.

Alienated Counter Culture

The deeply sobering element in these strong youthful vibrations that are disrupting our domestic calm is the acute sense of cultural alienation from which they seem to stem. It is a new type of alienation which we find difficult to define. It does not fit neatly into any of the commonly recognized categories of the phenomenon.

1

Marxist talk about the alienation of the worker from his labor doesn't strike deeply into the heart of the estrangement. Relatively few of these young people have been sufficiently involved in the shady employer-employee relationships of industry to understand first hand the growing fragmentation of labor which causes the worker "to be alienated from any sense of his role in the creation of his products" or to have actually experienced the injustices of a capitalistic system which "alienates (the worker) from the economic fruits of his labor and puts him in conflict with his fellow workers." The aesthetic alienation that drives the modern artist to veer from accepted modes of use of paint, brush, chisel, cinema or stage offers at best but tangential explanation. The prophetic view which traces alienation back to revulsion at the prevailing moral climate of the day is to some degree applicable, but this revulsion tends to follow most unusual channels. Nor does the psychological explanation which focuses attention upon the various aspects of the individual's infancy, childhood, adolescence, family and fantasy life which tend to produce the "alienated personality" offer a fully satisfactory interpretation.

Not even the sum total of these various traditional ways of probing at the source of phenomenon of alienation provides an adequate perspective in which to view the acute sense of estrangement that marks the thought and action of today's youth. It seems, as A. J. Tannenbaum notes, that these young people are "malcontents in search of identity in a world they must create for themselves"; and in creating it "they want no part of the world handed down to them by their elders."[4] To this observation Bloy adds the poignant judgment: "They are, in fact, participants in a 'counter culture' which is fundamentally challenging the western cultural tradition."[5] Roszak concurs with this assessment of the situation and carries the judgment a step further. Likening the present youthful uprising to the frightening "Invasion of the Centaurs" recorded in Greek mythology, he concludes:

> Indeed it would hardly seem an exaggeration to call what we see arising among the young a 'counter culture' . . . so radically disaffiliated from the main stream assumptions of our society that it scarcely looks to many as a culture at all, but takes on the alarming appearance of a *barbaric intrusion.*[6]

This tendency of youth to enunciate and live out counter-definitions of the taken-for-granted social routines of our western society resolves itself into a type of alienation that is potentially revolutionary.

Misleading Assumptions of Critics

A considerable group of critics depreciate the revolutionary potential of the new counter-culture by questioning its staying power. But usually they do so by basing their critique on two misleading assumptions: (1) dearth of capable, committed leadership; and (2) predominance of passive over activist following.

2

The critics using the leadership argument decry the use of demographic facts in assessing the true strength of the new culture. It is one thing, they say, to assert that half the North American population is under age 25 and nearly 40 million of this group aged 15-24, mostly clustered in massive educational complexes. Yet how many of these, even in the ferment of the provocative educational clusters, can be said to be capable, committed leaders? Probably only a few hard core activists, a very small percentage to say the least!

History provides striking examples of the fallacy of this line of reasoning. Christianity began with a core leadership of twelve (including one defector) in a Roman Empire of 60 million people, to the year 300 A.D. never won more than one ninth of this population to its constituency, yet through modes of evangelism depreciated by authorities, instituted a counter-culture which overthrew and superseded that of the Empire in the two centuries that followed.[7] Or if this is an unsuitable religious example encompassing too long a time span in history, what of the French Revolution? Only two per cent of the population of France was involved in this counter-cultural thrust which within the remarkably short span of two decades so violently re-directed the political, social and religious life of Europe.[8]

If such movements of centuries long past could turn their worlds upside down, what of today's youth who have a new powerful ally quite unknown to either the early Christians or to the French revolutionaries — modern mass communication. In our "global village" these mass media are capable of almost instantly multiplying the influence of a single committed leader hundreds or thousands of times over. The main outlets of the mass media — television, radio, press and film — have become saturated with documentaries, teach-ins, talk-backs and rock and roll sessions in which the new culture is popularized. Dedicated sociologists, probing psychologists, learned commentators, sensationalizing journalists, curiosity-motivated tourists, worried parents, confused clergy, vocal youth are all given their opportunity to air, tube or print their views of the developing phenomenon. The climate has become so favorable to the new trend that even the hated "establishment" has chosen to coopt the youth culture for its own purposes of exploitation. The production mechanism is now geared to make the most of the tremendously profitable "teen" and "early 20" market. Through skilled manipulation of the mass media what these age groups choose as fad is commercialized as the national norm, be it in the area of art, education, entertainment, fashion, hair style, manners, morals, music, politics, religion, speech or social relations (including love, courtship, marriage and sexual mores). As a result, probably the majority of those subjected to this assault in the United States and Canada have become willing purchasers within or hung-up victims of the commercialized youth market.[9] Toynbee saw this trend developing as far back as 1968 when on a visit to North America he was asked to pass judgment on the nature of the hippie movement, then at its height. His observation was that its adherents were "only" the "flamboyant . . . unsubmerged tenth part of the iceberg"; that the "same spirit" was "latent among . . .

(their) quiet contemporaries" who had "not advertised their alienation by giving themselves an unconventional outward appearance."[1"]

This large body of submerged fellow travellers of all ages evidence their basic sympathy with the new culture in many ways. Sometimes it is through the medium of long or short term moods — a whimsical realization that a long life of work has brought comfort and material success, but little true joy; or an irresistible urge to take off on some temporary odyssey of "kicks" as a means of escaping the slavery of a pedestrian life. Sometimes it is by way of adult realization that the young are actualizing ideas which we in our "square" way of living have had to hide in our secret thoughts — so older graduate students, younger faculty and on occasion senior faculty and administrators give covert or permissive support to undergraduate protests; so young married adults in the inner city and suburbia covenant to live the uninhibited moral life of experimenting youth under outward appearance of normalized home life; so parents retreat from disciplining their teen-agers for errant mores because in these deviations they sense the fulfilment of their own unexpressed adult desires. Meantime the pre-teen children are busy accelerating their own journey on the road of revolt by copying more and more the commercialized youth culture thrown at them through the mass media all hours of the day. Nor does one's racial or religious attachment assure protection against the onslaught. Blacks, Indians, French Canadians, and naturalized Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Orientals are all deeply affected; while Catholics, Protestants and Jews face alike the "soul trouble" of trying to adjust to youthful defection. Obviously it is misleading to confine the strength of the new culture to any fixed type of numerical count relating either to capable leadership or adherents. Influence of the new culture presses far beyond such norms.

The second misleading assumption of the critics of the counter culture — predominance of passive over activist following — also calls for like refutation. This misconception is based on a generally accepted division of rebelling youth into three main strata — students, the New Left, and the Hippies. The New Left are characterized as being wholesomely-oriented political activists, properly optimistic concerning the future, and pledged to achieve this future only through exercise of the time-honored procedures of the western democratic process. However, students and Hippies are considered to be less solid citizens. The former, it is contended, are rendered passive participants in any culture because they live, as psychiatrist Seymour L. Halleck says, in a constant "state of identity crisis" in which they cry "Who am I, I don't know what I believe, I have no self?"[11] Usually supported in their education by affluent parents, inexperienced in the art of making their own living, and highly apprehensive of the responsibility they will have to assume when thrust out of their academic retreat, they evidence a most "peculiar kind of apathy and withdrawal" from life.[12] Occasionally they may deviate from this general insensibility to life to take part in campus upheavals, but often as embittered, angered participants rather than supporters of a reasoned cause; then they quickly return to the safety of

4

their academic cloister. Hippies, it is asserted, are even less participatory in the current ferment. They are

> . . . those who do not protest at all, who simply smile, wave daffodils, cover the walls of their *quartiers* with graffiti suggesting we 'Legalize Living', and wear their own variety of campaign buttons the quintessential of which demands with purest obstinacy, 'Nirvana Now' . . . Lilies of the field and bearded and sandaled, they live on air, and love and, alas, drugs. They seek not to change our society, but simply to have nothing to do with it. They are in quest of experiences wholly mystical and internal on the one hand, and tribal on the other. The modern American style of the effective individual functioning in a coherent but competitive society is not for them.[13]

More analytic observers are not so inclined to exalt the influence of the New Left above that exerted by students and Hippies. They see the youth culture as a peculiar compound of all three forces, each making its own contribution, none of the three able to operate effectively when loosed from the creative potential latent in the other two.

This interlocking relationship was pre-determined by the student origins of the New Left. It was among the students of the exasperatingly "Quiet" and "Beat" generations of the 1950s that the contemporary political activism among youth first began to stir. The election of President Kennedy in 1960, coupled with his choice of a young Ivy League Brain Trust and his inaugural plea of "Ask not what your country can do for you" but "Ask what you can do for your country", served as the catalytic agent in Amreican college circles.[14] The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was founded in April of that year, mainly to further the cause of civil rights. The university generation quickly warmed to the challenge of sit-ins, boycotts, lunch-counter protests, school desegregation and voter registration in the South. Negro and white students worked side by side as shock troops; and they saw each other and those they wished to help beaten by local law officers, attacked by police dogs, jabbed by cattle prodders, doused by fire hoses and dispersed by tear gas.[15] Then in June 1962 this student activism moved to the Northern States through formation of the Students for Democratic Society (SDS) which gave philosophical grounding to the New Left in its much publicized *Port Huron Statement,* reading in part: "We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by the two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation."[16] There followed "The Day" in December 1964 when these radicals of SDS brought life on the Berkeley Campus of the University of California to a virtual standstill and pressured successfully for educational and political changes that are still being implemented.[17] This new type of political action moved first to other American universities and then to Canada with results too well known to merit further recount; it exhibited a curious combination

5

of socialism, anarchism and pacificism, but it was "New" with deep moral interests in persons as human beings, in sharp contrast to the crass amoral materialism of the "Old" Marxist Left who placed their faith in the laws of economic determinism.[18] So the New Left owed its origin to student activism.

When the Hippies began to blossom noticeably in 1966 they added a touch that both students and New Left valued. Perhaps never numbering more than 300,000 at any one time,[19] many of them were student drop-outs who sympathized with the educational uprisings of those who chose to stay on campus. Though essentially apolitical in their stance, their political views were basically those of the SDS, except that when stated they were stripped of any sophisticated metaphysical expressions and were more adamant in denouncing the materialism of western culture. It was this latter stand which kept them from participating in civil rights movements designed to secure equal job opportunities and wages for underprivileged minorities; and which in turn alienated these minorities from the Hippie cause, for few within the minority groups were prepared to forsake their enforced poverty for the voluntary poverty of the drop-out who could usually, at any time he chose, return to his former life of affluence.

Despite these meanderings from the main stream of youthful rebellion, the Hippies had something the students and the New Left needed to make their movement effective — a style they could bring to demonstrations. Whether they were street, household, tribal or master Hippies, when they could be persuaded to take part in protests they added what Stuart Hall calls "dramaturgy" to the occasion. They delighted in staging spontaneous "happenings" and "put-ons" which spoofed "straight" society. The act might include anything from the tossing of dollar bills from the gallery of the New York Exchange for which "bread" charcoal-grey-suited executives scrambled on the floor below, to descending upon the local police precinct whose officers had just arrested some of their buddies and offering to paint its dirty walls or to wash the squad cars or to hold a picnic for the officers' children. Sometimes obscenities, drugs and irregular moral acts were added to aid the communication of an idea through shock, but the whole show gave new definition to the political act.[20]

In short, the Hippies, from their origin through their heyday to now, have represented the "expressive" pole of the political movement of youth, while the students and the New Left have, in differing degree, represented the "activist" pole of this movement. The Hippies as "expressionists" have supplied the "psychic fuel", "the Dada-esque scenes", the speech, the manners, the dress, the music and other striking elements of the counter-culture; while the students and New Left as "activists" have supplied the organization and program by which they try to build on the response aroused by the exhibitionist expressionists. To be sure these expressionists opt in and out of society at will, but in their brief "in-moments" their "put-ons" and "happenings" have dramatic effect. Right now they are more out than in, but they will continue

6

to appear for their "moment" from time to time, if not as Hippies of yore, as a recognizable facsimile.[21]

To discount either the Hippie or the student contribution to the new culture is to misrepresent the true nature of the movement. The New Left owes a sizeable debt to both these groups.

Accordingly, in the succeeding consideration of the provoking factors leading to the youth revolt and of the new value system which these youth are seeking to institute, these three groups will be treated as if in common pursuit of the same goals. Distinctions will not be made between them except in instances where this approach could encourage grossly erroneous conclusions.

Provoking Factors of Revolt

The present rebellion of youth may, for convenience of consideration, be characterized as a six-pronged revolt against: (1) a meaningless middle class background of affluence; (2) parents who have capitulated passively to the materialistic values of the affluent society; (3) the dehumanizing liberal "system" which has made society and parents what they are; (4) the educational machine designed to preserve "the system" as it is; (5) "the bomb" which stands as the symbol of the determined intention of governing forces to export the system abroad by force; and (6) the Christian churches which seem to have forsaken their prophetic role to become allies of the inhumanities of "the system".

To say that the new counter-culturalists are protesting against the meaninglessness of their middle class background does little to limit the societal range of their movement. Since World War II the urban middle class business man's way of life has spread so widely that nearly 80 per cent of all North American families have the cash or credit with which to buy "almost anything mass produced, including higher education"; and also have access to "grants, loans, government handouts and pensions" which provide most of one's basic needs from cradle to grave.[22] In fact our society has become so predominantly middle class in its external expressions that to casual outside observers it could be taken to be "classless", save for the presence of underprivileged minorities of color. At least within the white collar group, financial promise, therefore affluence, is practically equal for all occupations. It is from the 15-24 year olds of our nearly classless affluent white population that the backbone of the counter-culture comes. Their grandparents and parents have achieved relative comfort, security, status and property. Their fathers have succumbed so completely to the concept of the "economic man" as to admit openly that the object of work is not work itself, but to make money with which to buy the status symbols of the affluent class. What Toynbee says of the Hippies applies generally to youth reared in such an atmosphere: "They are people who have had so much cake they have become sickened of it, not people who have cake for the first time and are greedy for it."[23] They find the price their fathers and grandfathers have paid for affluence too high, *viz.*

7

the spiritual poverty that issues from years of conscienceless manipulation and exploitation of persons and institutions for purposes of accumulating more and more goods and resources; and from increasingly ruthless use of the power that increasing affluence can bring. If this is the price of earning the paycheck the young, in their present state of idealism, are unwilling to pay it.

The revolt against parents is an integral part of the revolt against affluence. Fathers caught on the treadmill of goods-getting tend to discharge their parental duties financially rather than paternally. If a young son asks "What's God like?" "How do the stars work?" or "What do you do when you're in love?", Dad pleads the pressure of work and says "Here, kid, take a couple of bucks and go to the movie or to that championship game!" If not this, Dad is away at work or too often absent from home for "business reasons" to encourage much asking of his advice. This has the result of making the mother the dominant figure in the life of the home, with less than ideal consequences. The educated, emancipated woman left with major responsibility for the care of her children becomes frustrated with the shadowy, elusive husband constantly away in pursuit of money and things. The connubial dream degenerates into resented legal enslavement and an unhappy home in which nothing good seems to be said of the marriage contract. Maintaining lip-service to the sanctity of sex, one or both parents may seek outlet for pent-up emotional capital in escapades ranging from harmless flirtations to frequent adultery — about one of every three marriages ending eventually in divorce or separation. The children of such homes live in a state of pereptual emotional siege, subject daily to the psyhoses of a mother looking desperately to them for affection. This combination of the moral breakdown of the marriage and a mother starved for affection produces the femininely soft, spoiled youth whose permissive training often sends him to college with childhood traits that leave him unprepared upon graduation to face up to the shock of the barbered hair, puncuality, and other conformities required of him in the world of his "square" corporate employers. The emotional hang-ups that surface at this time of his realization of unpreparedness to meet life on terms required by the existing society leads him to review the situation in terms of the family life that has brought him to this crisis. In this critical review he does not like what he recalls. He finds the family life provided by his parents inadequate for the proper training of children. But unlike his status-conscious parents, he openly chooses to reject the traditional institution of the family — sometimes claiming satisfaction in his experimentations in new forms of sexual relations, sometimes experiencing tragic consequences.

Alienated as our young may feel from affluent middle class culture and from their parents, the primary target of their ire is the agency which has made this culture and their parents what they are — the "system" or "establishment". They find this system sick to its core and reject its entire fabric — its urban concentration; its industrialized technology; its "corporate liberalism" which permits an interlocking directorate of corporations to shape decisions and social structures not

8

with regard to the people affected but with regard to enhancing the opportunity for market and trade; and its centralization of power in a bureaucratic federal government too easily manipulated by its garrisoned corporate industrial interests. So long as this managed "liberal system" of society remains, youth hold no hope for change. It is beyond reform and must be replaced. Tom Hayden, a leading figure in the founding of the SDS, explains his reason for so thinking:

> My own disenchantment with the U.S. didn't really come because of its failures in Negro rights and foreign policy, but with the realization . . . that responsibility for these things lies with the most respectable people in society . . . people in the North with connections with the foundations, corporations and banks and the Democratic Party, who parade in their own suburban communities as liberals, but who happen to own, lock, stock, and barrel the major enterprises in Mississippi.[24]

The current Canadian concern over the economic invasion by the United States should make the core of this message strike directly home. It says that in our North American society "the problem is not man but an evil system which forces men to do evil deeds."[25] Acting as individuals respectable men would not wish to be party to the questionable social conduct indicated, or so wishing would not have the power to carry their desires to conclusion. The aim of youth is to supplant the present "system" which drives man to evil deeds against his brother. We may, therefore, as Moynihan suggests, "be witnessing the first heresies of liberalism" — an aggressive frontal attack on this "nigh universally accepted creed of the ruling elites of the Western world" in "all of its essentials of an optimistic belief in progress, in toleration, in equality, in the rule of law, and in the possibility of attaining a high and sustained measure of human happiness on earth."[26]

For the young the confrontation with "the system" becomes most acute in the higher stages of schooling and reaches its most critical point in the large impersonal structure of the state and provincial universities where demonstrations are frequently organized to protest the "compulsory miseducation" received. The protestors claim these massive institutions to be so subservient to the system that they suffer all of its ills. Run like other "industries" they are designed to turn out "human think machines" which, like all other objects mass-produced, are eventually used to implement the national purpose. What else could be expected from institutions which are an integral part of the general corporate structure of liberalism, so much so that they are governed by regents and trustees who are not educators but the same businessmen who compose the interlocking directorates of the corporations which control the decision-making processes of bureaucratic centralized state, provincial and federal governments? How can education so directed prepare persons to face the specific unique happenings of their own peculiar lives after graduation? Accordingly students strike first at the governing structure of the university. They demand radical redistribution of power within the academic community, the purpose being to

gain student autonomy, at least equal student say, in matters of curriculum, the hiring, firing and tenure of the faculty and the imposition of social and moral restrictions upon campus life. This means the abandonment of the "Big Daddy Complex" which in the past had led administrators to appoint house mothers to set permissible dormitory hours for women, police to determine permissible limits of campus political activity, advisers to rule on the permissibility of a study program, professors to specify permissible readings and approaches. Assuming the granting of such administrative changes, these educational revolutionaries go on to specify the program of the future. The university should open its doors more widely to persons with offbeat and unpopular orientations to ideas and the arts. The educational process itself should become more action-oriented. The traditional teacher/student role should be altered so as not to generate passivity in the student. This can be accomplished by replacing the old lecturer/listener relationship with group-learning situations involving direct personal encounter of teacher with student and student with student in an atmosphere of minimal, nominal or no authoritarian leadership. In these group encounters stress should be placed on seeking solutions to problems in which students are already individually involved. This approach assumes the willingness of teachers to ignore the old artificial barriers between disciplines and the old time divisions that have fragmented their instruction, and to participate as teams in the encounter-group search for answers to students questions. The approach also assumes the willingness of teachers to revise their indices for evaluation of the student's personal progress in his encounter situation, perhaps even the forsaking of a grading system, if not the latter, the forsaking of the coercive standardizing influence of the present system of evaluation. All considered it is an approach that runs quite counter to the concept of the university held in the past. We had best listen with an attentive ear. Unimpressed as we may be with its bizarre extremism that goes so far as to found "anti" and "free" universities where instructors, scarcely out of their teens, offer courses in "anti-cultures", "anti-environments", "anti-poetry", "anti-theatres", "anti-families" — there is a basic apocalyptic message here. Not only this. Similar ideology is filtering down to the high schools and upper elementary grades, in diluted dosage but in sufficient strength to cause vibrations there as well.[27]

The Bomb is the most powerful symbol the young can find to dramatize their horror at the persistent American attempts to export by force their liberal concepts of affluence, family, system and education. All of these young have grown up since Hiroshima, but the documentraies of the mass media have made an indelible impression on their minds. In that ghoulish-looking mushroom cloud which generates almost instantaneously that blinding, all-destructive flash of thermonuclear fire, their dreams are exploded. The most fearful take it for granted that they may not survive another ten years, turn amoral, and ignore almost completely the restraints and responsibilities of preparing for a career or bringing up a family. The more idealistic youth asks "What further proof do we need that the present political leadership is misguided?"; and he presses the logic of his argument to consideration

10

of the issues at stake in western participation in the war in Vietnam. What right, he asks, have the political leaders of the west to export their liberal culture in this lethal manner when the political, moral, economic, intellectual and religious life is so sick back home. The immediate need is to eradicate the racism, remaining poverty, lingering streak of brutal violence and other moral sickness at home. According to the post-Hiroshima generation, the Vietnam conflict is a "snow-job" inflicted upon us by supposedly honorable men who read maps, issue commands, push buttons and tally the dead — not because they wish to do so, but because the propaganda of the corporate military-industrial system has psyched or forced them into the evil deed. The "Make Love Not War" slogan, the burning of draft cards, the lying to draft board examiners, and the slipping away to Canada are all symbolic gestures of rejection of the faceless bureaucratic system that drives men to evil deeds against each other. These rebels wish a new social order in which the individual has the right to choose for himself whether he will train to kill, or, having so trained, will accept orders to do so without regard to the morality of the specific cause involved.[28]

The final major provoking factor in the revolt of youth relates to a growing disillusionment with western expressions of Christianity. The various Christian churches, in differing degrees, seem to stand as bulwarks of the established system. They appear to represent the faith of the worried adults over 30 years of age, who wish to enforce conformity to the existing mode of life, including its social and racial injustices. Despite the obviously declining mediatorial role of the churches — their growth as a whole having in this present decade, for the first time in over a century, ceased to equal the median growth of the population — they are trying to hang on to the old privileged position by substituting the pressures of institutional coercion for the former intrinsic authority of a message their leaders no longer convey convincingly.[29] The Protestant churches are the harder hit, particularly those of the Calvinist-Puritan tradition. The customary association of this main-line tradition of Protestantism with a this-wordly "asceticism of work" (as if one's work was a predestined "divine calling") appears to the young not only to be a tool that adds zeal to the capitalist quest for goods and wealth; but also a principle of living which leads pointlessly to the premature, joyless wearing out of the bodies and minds of their elders.[30] Similarly the moderate rational ethic of this line of Protestantism is said to reduce the joys of life the more by imposing the principle of sombre dignity in the display of any affluence gained by feverish work.[31] Further, it is contended, the predilection of this line of Protestanism to encourage the principle of the scientific mastery of nature has created the robotized educational system which has supplied the pool of research and executive minds which, unversed in the humanities, have in turn created the faceless bureaucratic corporations which have brought our system to its present social sickness.

So thoroughly have these beliefs alienated youth from the churches that they have been exiting from our western Christian milieu *en masse.* A sample survey of the Hippies at their height revealed that 92 per cent

11

were either church "drop-outs" or without any previous formal attach-
ment to a church at all.[32] Most held the "Mustang Pledge" and "Apostles'
Creed" in equal contempt.[33] The appeal that Scripture has held in the
past history of western social heresy is all but absent in this new up-
rising. These young are rejecting the rationalist skeptical profession
of the Christian faith so commonly preached from the pulpit and paraded
by church theologians in their recent "death of God" binge. Bored with
the absence of God in the early twentieth century and tired of personal
spiritual emptiness, the young generation is dropping out of the churches
to find a new, committed life-style of its own.

New Life-Style

The new youth culture is at the moment more a "style" than a
"system" of living. Amorphous and still emerging, it is too undisciplined,
too loosely organized, and as yet too unideological to evidence any set
form. Still, it does exhibit a certain consistency and pattern of develop-
ment. In their own hiplingua this pattern follows the basic sequence of
"drop out", "tune in", "turn on"; and "hang loose" with regard to the
future. Translated into conventional language this means a voluntary
opting out of the present system to pursue a style of life evidencing in
dramatic ways: (1) a new personalism, (2) a new communalism, (3) a
new morality, and (4) a new religious orientation. The adjective "new"
refers more to the intensity with which these characteristics are revealing
themselves, than to the uniqueness of their expression, for all, as shall
be seen, have been present before in history in other forms.

The nature of the new personsalism is enunciated clearly in the
SDS *Port Huron Statement:* "We regard *men* as infinitely precious
and possessed of unfulfilled capacities for reason, freedom and love . . .
We oppose the depersonalization that reduces human beings to the
status of things . . . the vague appeals to 'posterity' cannot justify the
mutations of the present."[34] Here is a moving expression of the belief
that the basic dimension of life is biographical. No effort to erect a
social structure to assure the salvation of man will succeed unless the
men involved in creation of structure give first attention to the changing
of their own lives.

But this new personalism has deeper meanings as well. It is based
on the assumption that a man *can* change his life from what it is to what
it ought to be in an environment which places a high premium on
individualism, freedom, immediate experience and the importance of the
"existential now". The stress on individualism is on the one hand an ex-
treme capital "I" protest against the familiar figure of the over-
managed, over-directed, over-routinized middle class "organization"
man; on the other hand a strong capital "I" assertion of the uniqueness
of every individual as a created being, a concept quite capable of de-
veloping into an ego-idealism. The stress on freedom is at its root a
psychological thrust, evidencing on the one hand a protest against
authoritarianism, paternalism, manipulation, institutionalism and nar-
row industrial notions of efficiency; on the other hand a positive con-

cern for the creation of a society in which men are actually able to make real choices and decisions. The stress on experience is a reaction against a regimented, status-conscious, experience-starved culture; but also an evangelical assertion of the principle of "consciousness consciousness" which engenders in the person the courage "to do his own thing." The stress on the existential now is fundamentally a reaction against the rationalized Protestant work/play ethic weighted so heavily on the side of work before play; but also an assertion that real life is a day to day happening made joyous only when one is free in mind and spirit to respond spontaneously to the particular event. One must hang loose to the point that he is always free "to do his own thing now" — to speak, to sing, to dance, to love, to serve as the irretrievable existential moment urges. When the new personalism is allowed to operate within the full scope of its deeper meanings, it is assumed that commitment will be to the radical life style of the "changed-man" capable of delivering the *coup de grace* to the discredited depersonalized society of the present.[35]

The new communalism of the young is a natural accompaniment of their intensely personal approach to life. In accord with the SDS *Port Huron Statement,* they feel that "loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man and man today"; and that "these dominant tendencies" in the lives of persons "cannot be overcome by better personnel management, nor by improved gadgets", but "only when a love of men overcomes the idolatrous worship of things by man."[36] The youth who penned this statement had derived this sense of the need of close communal relations between persons through the school of hard experience. As lonely, frightened, estranged individuals they had set out to reform peacefully an awesomely organized corporate society with all the forces of law at its command. Then, when the law moved against them, they experienced together being beaten by police, sharing the same jail cells, and the subsequent struggle of finding a viable group consensus for the continuation of their cause. The result was the emergence of deep regard for the warmth of personal relations and the potential for effective planning inherent within the small group encounter. The approach developed politically into the concept of "participatory democracy" which was adopted as a plan for introducing the principle of self-help among the disadvantaged classes. Volunteer youth moved into the ghetto and helped form community organizations in which the people gained a sense that they were real persons after all, able to make for themselves the decisions that would effect their futures. This communal emphasis presumes a tolerance which ignores differences of race, religion, sex and political party for the purpose of attaining unified action toward a specific goal. But this tolerance is not wishy-washy. It comes to an end when someone infringes upon the obvious rights of another. Then come direct confrontations ranging from the defence of the right to use definitely illegal marijuana to the open support of conscientious objectors, Black Panthers and FLQ in their struggles with the Establishment. Like the SDS, however, most youth stop short of violence; they find it "to be abhorrent because it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate."[37]

The new morality of the new culture is what brings the most wrinkles to the brow of the older generation. Without doubt one can see a basic moral purity of witness in the youthful idealistic emphasis upon integrity of thought and action, compassion for people, advocacy of a more simple form of life, and the refusal to compromise. Yet there is also a polar emphasis evidencing indifference to all traditional morality and an unabashed, deliberate cultivation of a deviant, sensate, often self-indulgent ethic of compulsive enjoyment. Frightened adults level the charge of depravity and hint at or urge the need for more rapped knuckles, stricter supervision in school, stiffer curfews and jail sentences, or a stint of exile in the army. Youth ask, in turn, how their elders, who are busy giving their support to the blowing up of whole countries and peoples with the bomb, can speak with authority on the question of morality. The real flack flies when attention is focussed on matters of love and sex. Here again one can see a basic moral strength in the approach of youth. Love is in a very real way the central point about which all their moral action revolves. They have chosen the flower to symbolize the depth of this love: it incorporates the tenderness, openness, gentleness, receptivenss and passive resistance with which they intend to "super-zap" the whole of mankind into their way of living and thinking. But the idealists within the movement are finding that there are fellow travellers who see the symbolism of the flower in other light and interpret the love it stands for to be the gay, the natural, the wild, the primitive and the various plants from which hallucinogenic drugs can be distilled.[38] It is the element within the movement that gives the new morality the connotation of a crusade bent on liberation of society from all the repressive taboos that surround the middle class concept of sex. The pilgrimage advocated is from an abhorred Christian doctrine of "Original Sin" to the childlike purity of "Original Innocence". So interpreted the concept of pure love is surreptitiously extended to condone covenanted sexual agreements between pre-marital couples and couples who reject marriage by choice; and also mutually agreed upon extra-marital sexual relations of alienated partners in marriage. The picture within this segment of the movement is further complicated by an insistence upon the equality of the sexes in making the above choices, the steadily fading line of distinction between masculinity and femininity, the growth of pan-sexuality and the near complete removal of checks on the literary and visual presentation of the intimate details of all aspects of sex life. Panicky observers see a scene of unrestrained sexuality. Yet on a closer look one gets the impression "that unlike classical hedonism this (trend) is a penultimate, not an ultimate"; the real objective seems to be, perhaps through a purposeful temporary use of shock-technique, "the recovery of the feeling of life in general".[39] These present sexual aberrations appear to be passing extreme expressions of a more solid personalism and communalism which will prove to be the lasting elements of the revolution the young seek to accomplish.

14

The new religious orientation of the young confirms the judgment that "the recovery of the feeling of life in general" is high in their list of pre-requisites for the founding of their new culture. This orientation is in the direction of mystical experience, but not in the customary forms in which mysticism has welled up and receded from time to time in western culture. The journey this time is to the East, with a bit of nostalgic recall of odds and ends of American Indian religious life added for good measure. The red-man bears consideration because he is the noble descendant of the Asiatic races, fighting a heroic minority battle on American soil to retain a precious eastern heritage. But, except for touches added in the way of primitive apparel and drug-induced passivity, the way of the American Indian become lost in a phantasmagoria of eclectic, erotic, exotic, occultish Far Eastern mystical thought and practice. The mixture tends to defy any known religious classification, but for lack of better designation is called "popularized Zen".

Recognized oriental masters of Buddhism claim that Zen cannot be popularized, basing their contention on the argument that a religion which cultivates personal illumination as the ultimate experience cannot be communicated intellectually. In such a religion the enlightening spark breaks through in utterly unpredictable ways while the devotee is practicing demanding disciplines under the guidance of a master. Nevertheless under the tutelage of self-appointed western popularizers of eastern mysticism — the likes of Gary Snyder, Alan Watts, Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac — North American youth have become convinced that they are being taught the real Zen and are becoming true practitioners of it.

Why are youth so strongly attracted to the practice of popularized Zen? The answer seems to be that the principles emphasized in the popularization fit the style of the new youth culture to a "T". To begin with, the character of Buddha is an attractive one. Though his father was a king, he chose to "drop out" of society, to return later with his begging bowl to convert his father.[10] Far more significant, however, is the vulnerability of Zen teaching to what Roszak calls "adolescentization". As reworked by western popularizers, Zen is made to dovetail remarkably with the main traits of adolescent life. By elevating "wise silence" over the "preachiness" of Christianity, this popularized Zen strikes an alliance with the "moody inarticulateness" of youth. By urging "commitment to paradox and randomness", it brings ready response from youth who are experiencing "the intellectual confusion of healthily restless, but still unformed minds". Being antinomian in ethic, it provides an outlet for the adolescent need for freedom from the conformities and exactions of somber middle class life. Full of sex and "hyperbolic eroticism", it provides a pretext for the license many of the young are taking in the field of sex to mock the post-World War II middle class permissiveness of their parents in this area. Further, the Zen concept of inner enlightenment, or the attainment of Nirvana, is quite without reason equated with the mystical experience of the drug trip. Empha-

15

size as one will that this adolescentized popularization of Zen is but a crude imitation of the real thing, the young still respond ecstatically to the teaching and take off on sprees of compulsive gay rejection of "the joyless, rapacious and egomaniacal order of our technological society".[41]

Fundamentally this ecstatic response to the popularized Zen is a healthy, instinctive protest against the scientific conception of man and nature that prevails in the West. But it has also let loose among youth a chaotic mumbo-jumbo of religious practice which can be said "to resemble nothing so much as a cultic hothouse of the Hellenistic period, when every manner of mystery and fakery, ritual and rite, inter-mingled in a marvellous indiscrimination".[12] This "Jungian stew" often becomes a *pot-pourri* in which the original base of popularized Zen becomes lost in an overload of parings from Sufism, Hinduism, Primitive Sham-anism, Theosophy, Left-Handed Tandra, Satanism, Neo-Gnosticism, Dervishism, Swamism — and yes, even Prophetic Judaism and Hip Christianity. When the last named ingredient is added, one is greeted with such a campaign slogan as: "May the baby Jesus open your mind and shut your mouth."[43] If not this then the mature Christ is likely to be hailed as "the hippiest guy in the world" or "God's Atom Bomb" or some other coined superlative.

Rather than be jarred by such goings-on, we should probably take the view that the young are on another one of their frequent spoofing trips. Quite likely they have conjured up this unintelligible mumbo-jumbo of religion to ridicule the unafthomable jargon that today's physical and social scientists parade before the public with seeming liturgical reverence. Are they not poking fun at the scientific guru who chants morning, noon and night the near incomprehensible methodo-logical mysteries of "structures", "variables", "inputs", "outputs", "cor-relations", maximizations", *ad infinitum?* What else is this but the witches' brew of black magic — especially when the war set add their mysterious incantations to the strangling potion. They chant "escalation" to indicate their intention of bombing out a little Asian country which would prefer to make its own choice between communism and demo-cracy; "deterrence" to indicate their intention of destroying any civilians who dare resist the military; "kill ratio" to indicate the comparative numbers slaughtered by contending armies in battle; "body count" to indicate the total corpses of the day.[41] If supposed adults conjure up this incomprehensible type of black magic to hoodwink the public, why can't the young roam at will in their own cultic hot-house of eastern mystical *pot-pourri?*

This they are certainly doing, bringing to their cause nearly all of the external features associated with a conscious religious movement. They purposely "drop out" of square society to seek a more meaningful life. This withdrawal serves as the "psychic pause" which brings emo-tional conversion. The conversion experience is strengthened by com-mitment to the living of the "good life" in various small group settings apart from the main institutions of the old society. In such settings the new life is often celebrated by the adoption of the use of formalized liturgy, sometimes composed by group members, but more often taken

16

from Sanskrit literature or phonetically appealing religious pieces preserved in the dead languages. A variety of new sacraments are devised — the communal experience of shared danger; the shared experience of friendly small-group encounters; the ecstatic sharing of sexual union; and especially the shared experience of drug and musical "trips". The drug trip incorporates such shared acts as passing a "joint" like a peace pipe while quoting Genesis 1:11, "Let the earth bring forth grass";[1] then the adding of the group consensus: "It's us against them. It's like the early Christians. You can get fed to the lions for using drugs."[16] The musical trip of rock and roll is the most satisfying of all:

> The music is not merely loud; it penetrates you. You hear it with your legs, your thighs, your belly, and your bowels. Even the lights have more than a merely visual effect; you do not see what is happening, you happen, too — all of you. More than anybody else the musicians are caught up in it . . . when they play, they play with their whole bodies, giving themselves up to a kind of ecstacy. But it's a cool ecstacy if such a thing exists.[47]

To such sacraments are added the various "sacred" books — the printed popularizations of Zen above-mentioned; the erotic code-books of eastern religions; *I Ching;* Kahlil Gibran's *The Prophet;* the writings of Mahatma Gandhi; the novels of Hermann Hesse, especially the oriental *Siddhartha;* the poetry of William Blake and Walt Whitman; the works of Henry David Thoreau; etc. Places of meeting are brightened with various forms of psychedelic art, including the artistic use of lights which flash shifting colors across walls, floors and ceilings at controlled speeds. Distinctive dress adds further to the color of the movement, also symbolic meanings to the new way of life. Oriental robes, sandals, bangles, beads, tinkling bells, flowers, beards, long hair with the Indian head band, even Nazi Swastikas and German Iron Crosses, are worn — all meant to convey specific positive or negative meanings to onlooking members of the Establishment. Peculiar speech is encouraged as another means of dramatizing the unique nature of the counter-thrust. Published vocabulary guides reveal a range of verbal expression running alphabetically from "acapulco gold" (high grade marijuana from Mexico) and "acid" (LSD) to "wig" (your mind) and "zap" (to hit in a figurative sense, to overwhelm).[48] Actual institutional religious organization is rare, the "Neo-American Church" perhaps being the most outstanding example. The devotion is rather to the new style of life itself, with a commendable emphasis on the necessity of losing one's old life to find a wholly new one; and upon the bearing with love any persecution by the Establishment.

This overview of the quest in which the revolting young are engaged substantiates the results of the recent study Karl Garrison has made of "the religious character" of the New Left. Orienting this study to Howard Becker's theory that "when the secular — i.e. the ordinary, neutral and relative — values become dominant in a given culture, then a quest for the sacred becomes manifest in its youth", he concluded after six months of disciplined sociological research that the youth of this

movement "are indeed engaged in that sacral quest".[49] As has been further remarked, "it is not the brand of religion that Billy Graham or William Buckley would choose for youth's crusade, but nonetheless it is religion."[50]

Historical Analogy

The disconcerting element in this scene, especially for the worried adults of traditional western upbringing, is that the young feel so alienated from the Christian faith that they are turning elsewhere for their religious motivation. Unable to detect any real difference between the basic value system promoted by today's Christian churches and that of the detested liberal establishment, they assume moribundity of the former beyond the point of recovery. Thus they introduce a new culture stressing counter values to both those of the churches and society, beginning with frivolous spoofings of the old ways of living and working gradually toward solutions of the deeper problems of religious meanings which have spurred them to revolt.

Only a generation of youth so ignorant of history as those absorbed in today's feverish existential quests could dismiss so casually the lessons of the past 1900 years of western history. Throughout this history the high points have certainly been those in which Christians of New Left, student and Hippie orientations have combined their creative capacities to set in motion, and nurture to maturity, pulsating counter-cultures which have, in remarkably short periods of time, revolutionized the value systems of established societies grown moribund. Western civilization seems to have a built-in (if faltering) rhythm of recurring moral relapses countered by the rise of healthy, strident movements of dissent which lead to recovery of former vital spiritual living. The task of today's adults is to make the totality of Christian history so live and real to our young that they can see that the most potent counter-cultural weapon is perhaps the very faith they are at the moment declaring inconsequential. We must take seriously the fact that youth have been so completely absorbed in an existential conflict with churches that seem to be the bulwark of an oppressive established society that they have not had, or at least have not taken, the time to check back and find that what they are revolting against is but a simulation of the Christian witness which has, on many occasions in the past, set out to upset whole structures of inhuman civilizations and has succeeded in doing just that.

This contention can be illustrated best by turning all the way back to the beginnings of the Christian movement itself. Brought to birth in a Roman Empire which appeared to be at its zenith, the early Christians saw another picture than did the majority of conforming citizenry. True, the marvellous communication system by land and sea was the best the western world had ever known. The arts and sciences had achieved heretofore unknown glory. Internal safety seemed assured by an impenetrable ring of armed forces stationed at all strategic border points where barbarian forces were likely to attack. The affluence of

the governing classes had seldom been more pronounced. But that psyhcic Christian minority saw signs of sickness at the core of society which convinced them that "the world was passing away" (I John 3:13). They perceived clearly that the real god of the Roman Empire was the state, much as the New Left of today see the real god of the United States and Canada to be the liberal establishment. Estranged by ethos and social class from the official Roman culture, the primitive Christians fashioned a minority counter-culture of their own. And a perverse culture it was. Seemingly nobodies at the time, these compulsive non-conformers withdrew from the comforts of safe living within the recognized system, forsook property to live together in a community pattern of hand to mouth existence, and were seized from time to time with a Pentecostal ecstacy that exhibited all the outward manifestations of a drug induced psychedelic trip. They were a thoroughly outrageous set of intruders — a "peculiar people" (Titus 2:4), already decried in New Testament times as "these that have turned the world upside down" (Acts 17:6). Frightened at the presence of this new, obstinate minority in their midst a crowd gathered at a circus in Carthage cried out against them, "How long must we endure this third race" (the previously recognized races being the Romans and the Jews). Tertullian, the most distinguished Carthagian convert to Christianity at this time, added substance to this "third race" charge by becoming a second-century proto-type of the presently exiled but recently worshipped guru of today's psychedelic set, Timothy Leary. The following striking parallels can be found in the instructions given by these two men to their followers:

Tertullian	*Leary*
Political life is to be shunned	It is possible to live in this
Trade is scarcely 'adapted for a	planet without joining the
servant of God' for apart from	antilife social systems . . .
covetousness . . . there is no	Drop out.
real motive for acquiring it.	American social institutions are
Academicians, typified by the	lustful of material and things.
philosophers, having nothing	Quit your job . . . for good.
in common with 'the disciples	Present education methods are
of heaven'; they corrupt the	neurologically crippling and
truth, they seek their own	antagonistic to your cellular
fame, they are mere talkers	wisdom. Quit school . . . for
rather than doers.	good.[52]

Like today's youth, the earliest Christians disdained affluence. To the writer of the *Shepherd of Hermas* and his followers, poverty was as much a mark of the Christian life as it was with the late medieval Spiritual Franciscans. Wealth was a worldly acquisition that it was the duty of the ordinary Christian to renounce, and for the higher orders of the ministry its renunciation was a necessity. Since slaves were in that day a part of the property of the affluent classes, a stand had to be taken concerning this type of wealth. Though early Christians never came to the point of advocating the complete emancipation of slaves, they did sense that in the teaching of Jesus the legal right to hold other men in

19

bondage was limited by the higher law of love. So Clement of Alexandria came to insist that "slaves are men like ourselves" and should be treated according to the "Golden Rule"; and Lactantius defended newly converted Christians who retained slaves who had earlier been in their household by explaining to outsiders: "Slaves are not slaves to us. We deem them brothers after the spirit, in religion fellow servants." To give further credence to this position, the marriage of slaves was urged in contradistinction to the common practice of unlegalized cohabitation. Most revolutionary of all, this human commodity — which could be bought on auction as an agricultural or domestic "implement" for less than £20 per male head — was, after conversion, permitted to be ordained a deacon, presbyter or bishop in the rising church. Roman governors, envisioning the creation of a rival institution capable in time of arousing the massive slave constituency of the Empire (nearly a third of the whole population) to revolt, did all in their power to seek out bondsmen converted to the new faith and sentence them to the inevitable death of the dreaded concentration camp (ergastulum) which provided free enforced labor for agriculture and the mines.

Also like today's youth, the early Christians found themselves at odds with the prevailing concepts of parenthood and family life. One of the earliest charges placed against them was that of being "a busybody" in domestic relations (1 Peter 4:15). When the early Christian missionary entered a Roman household and converted one of its members over the objections of others, he justified the division wrought in family life by quoting Matthew 10:34-36: ". . . I am come not to bring peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law . . . a man's foes shall be those of his own household." This family tension was sometimes increased by literal application of the saying in Matthew 23:9: "And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven." Accordingly Christians in Gaul and Asia Minor commonly refused to call any man father. Lucian of Antioch went so far in this direction that when hailed before a judge and asked "Of what parents are you born?", he responded firmly "I am a Christian and a Christian's only relatives are the saints." At this point the question of marriage entered to excite other tensions. Many were attracted by Paul's teaching that chastity was preferable to marriage if one could by nature cope with the denials required in this type of life. Those who chose this path were considered traitors to the Roman concept of *familia*. When marriage was chosen over chastity, other problems arose. A mixed marriage between a Christian and a partner who retained the old Roman religion, be it a premeditated union or the result of the conversion of one of the partners to marriage, was quite likely to produce a schizophrenic child such as the daughter commemorated by the second-century tombstone inscription: "She was a pagan among pagans, a believer among believers." Such a marriage could also produce the Christian wife whose reverence for children had been so increased by her devotion to the "Child of Bethlehem" that she refused to obey her pagan husband's legal right of *patria potestas* (privilege to expose unwanted children) when he, away on a trip, wrote about the child ex-

pected to be born in his absence, "if it proves to be a girl throw it out".
The early condonement of the marriage of a Christian daughter to a
converted freedman brought still more disruption to the Roman concept
of marriage. This was outright disobedience to Roman law which pro-
hibited such marriages. Even death brought its family tensions, for
rather than permit a Christian to be buried by heathen rites, wives were
put to rest in separate Christian cemeteries apart from pagan husbands,
and children apart from a heathen parent.[54]

Again like today's youth, the early Christians stood strong against
the established "system". They took their first stand in this sphere by
refusing to worship Caesar, at designated local altars, as god, affirming
with the Scillitan martyrs: "We give honour to Caesar as Caesar; we
offer worship to God alone." Tertullian justified this position, explain-
ing: "We engage in these conflicts (with the State) as men whose very
lives are not our own . . . We have no master but God." This was
the way the early Christians asserted their chosen position as "bond-
servants of Christ" their "Crucified Head". Tertullian also urged Chris-
tians to extend this obstinacy to the refusal to hold public office, because
the duties of magistrates included superintendency of pagan spectacles,
the torturing of declared criminals (including recalcitrant Christians)
at such spectacles, and the presiding over sacrifices to pagan gods. In
all such ways the politics of the Roman "system" were considered "alien"
to the Christian way of life.[55]

Still again like today's youth, the early Christians had their version
of aversion to "The Bomb". In an age when the army was the symbol
of patriotism and a semmingly sure guarantee of safety against the ad-
vancing hordes of barbarians, many Christians found themselves faced
with a compulsory military service they could not conscientiously fulfil.
If one was promoted to officer's rank his position was particularly diffi-
cult, for it was the officer's duty to supervise sacrifice and worship
at the altar of the emperor. Refusal to perform the duty required resig-
nation of rank and life. Such was the case with a Christian centurion
in Trojan's army in Tangiers, when shortly after his appointment to
this rank he was ordered to preside over sacrifices to Caesar. Horrified
at what he saw he suddenly flung away his centurion's vinestick and
cried:

> I am a soldier of Jesus Christ the eternal king. I have done
> with fighting for your emperors. I despise the worship of deaf
> and dumb gods of wood and stone. If the terms of service are
> such that one is bound to offer sacrifices to gods and emperors,
> then I refuse to be a soldier.

Quickly he was led away and beheaded, but not before he turned to his
escorting guards and said, in committed Hippie style, "God Bless You."[56]
There are records of scores of early Christian soldiers who were con-
demned to death for similar offenses, their crime being essentially that
of placing their devotion to God above that to the system's all-engulfing
oath: "My country right or wrong, but always my country."

In the light of this sampling of the character of early Christian life, one has to ask the self-answering question of Moynihan:

> Can there be any mistaking that the New Left speaks to the rational, tolerant, reasonable society of the present with the same irrationality, intolerance and unreasonableness, but possibly also the same truth with which the absurd Christians spoke to Imperial Rome?[57]

There can hardly be any such mistaking.

The early Christian revolt also incorporated elements akin to the student protest and the staged Hippie theatrics of today's youth.

The student contribution to the early Christian cause was nascent for obvious reasons. As Paul had said "not many wise . . . after the flesh" had been "called" (I Cor. 1:26) to endure the deprivations involved. Had it been otherwise there still was no universal plan of compulsory public or unclassed university education which clustered large number of the Empire's youth in conclaves of potential revolt. Nevertheless, such early Christians as were students had to face what Augustine called "the wine of error held to our lips by drunken teachers." He was referring to an academic curriculum based on the study of pagan literature, including the teaching of the names and myths of the gods of the old system and the ethic of the Epicureans. Some scholars compromised, as those who began each day of study with the covert recitation of a short Christian prayer. But the early tendency was to "drop out" of the official stream of education to share in the clandestine catechetical and disciplinary instruction of small group encounters. Here those seeking church membership were prepared for baptism and thereafter schooled in "denial for Christ" that they might face the tests of persecution, and, if need be, martyrdom.[58] This was, then, a very simple pattern of "drop out" student revolt which added to the effectiveness of the early Christian revolt.

The general style of early Christian living had much more in common with the present day Hippie flair for the dramatic and delight in staging happenings which administer cultural shock. The form and hour of the weekly Christian meeting led worried Jews and Romans to wonder at the sanity of this new breed of religionists. The secrecy in which meetings were held to avoid apprehension by hostile authorities created a thick aura of suspicion concerning purpose. Day and time of meeting elicited further concern. To the Jew the practice of gathering on the "first day of the week" to celebrate the resurrection of the Lord was blaspheming of the "seventh day" Sabbath. To the sleepy, revelling Roman the practice of gathering "before dawn" was meeting at an ungodly hour whatever day of the week. Suspicion mounted with time, until as Mommsen says, the Roman public became obsessed with conviction that "the Christian conventicles were orgies of lewdness, and receptacles of every crime." The "holy kiss" or "kiss of peace" which Paul had encouraged as an act of worship (Rom. 16:16, etc.) brought the derisive Roman comment, "See how these Christians love one another!";

22

also subsequent malicious gossip about "these unholy kisses, full of poison, counterfeiting sanctity." Hostile outsiders reported that evening agapes, also held in utmost secrecy, were occasions at which all forms of immorality were practiced in "the shamelessness of darkness". "Three things," said the Christian apologist Athenagoras, "are alleged against us: Atheism, Thyestean feasts, and Oedipodean intercourse" — in other words Atheism, in the sense lack of regard for the usual Roman accoutrements of worship such as altars, images, temples, etc.; cannibalism, stemming from the belief that infants taken by their parents to the secret agapes were sacrificed to supply the "body" and "blood" served at the occasion; and incest. New customs of dress and speech added further elements of cultural shock. The new attire was neither gaudy nor special; the emphasis was simply upon use of ordinary dress with purposeful avoidance of ostentation. The new speech was distinctive. Using their favorite symbol, the primitive Christians called themselves "little fish" (in recall of their new birth in baptismal waters), or "the new born" or "the newly caught". They added Christian names to their given names, as Ignatius who added the name "Theophorus" and Cyprian who added the name "Caecilius". As password greeting, and parting benediction they used the Aramaic "Maran-atha" (I Cor. 16:22 — "Our Lord Cometh").[59]

When St. Anthony retired in the third century to take up his hermit life in the remote recesses of the Egyptian desert, the privations of this rigorous life brought to the fore experiences quite on a par with present-day bizarre descriptions of a "bad" Hippie "trip" induced by an overdose of drugs. Says Athanasius in describing Anthony's "trip".

> . . . Assuming the shapes of all sorts of wild beasts and snakes, they immediately filled the place with figures of lions, bears, leopards, bulls, wolves, asps, scorpions and other snakes, each crying out in its particular way: the lions roared as if intent on devouring him, the bulls made as though to gore him and the wolves to leap at him, the snakes slithered over the ground and darted towards him. The appearance of each of these creatures was as cruel as it was fierce and their hissing and crying was horrible to hear.[60]

When erratic Gnostics were attracted to Christian spirituality they sometimes went in Anthony's direction of renouncement of all material possessions, but more often introduced an "Adamite" emphasis which had other deviant implications. Assuming Christ to be the "Second Adam" who had re-won for man the lost innocence of the "First Adam", these "children of love" cried out upon conversion "I am Christ", and, in the pantheistic belief that they were in a state of perfection which was sinless, proceeded from anarchy to anarchy, including in the range of their antinomian activity open sexual promiscuity.[61] Certainly these Hippie-like fringe developments brought alarming dramaturgy to the early Christian counter culture. Then, as now, such happenings injected elements of shock which forced the old society to respond.

23

Would space permit, similar historical analogies could be drawn between today's counter culture of alienated youth (including New Left, student and Hippie phases) and Medieval, Reformation and early modern religious dissent. For such medieval analogies, it is possible only to refer the reader to two exceptionally fine studies in this period: N. F. C. Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millenium* (Fairlawn, N. J.: Essential Books, Inc., 1957); and J. B. Russell, *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965). Both works show how the ills that beset Italian and Flemish towns in the Middle Ages contracted the oportunity of their middle class and artisan young and set in motion youth revolts similar to those of today. For Reformation analogies two further books should prove helpful in stimulating thought along the counter-cultural theme: A. Gish, *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1970), who stresses the likenesses of the Anabaptist and New Left movements; and P. Goodman, *The New Reformation: Notes of a Neolithic Conservative* (New York: Random House, 1970), who offers random but quite provocative comparison of Reformation and present day youth revolts. These two works evidence clearly the deep feeling of alienation that could lead so theologically conservative a reformer as Luther to cry: "God has turned His face away; things have no meaning; I am estranged in the world." (Goodman, p.49). They also emphasize the youthfulness and high educational status of the reformers. Though Luther was 34 when he posted his 95 theses, Melanchton was only 20, Bucer 26, Munzer 28, Jonas 24; and their supporters were chiefly undergraduates and junior faculty (*Ibid.,* p.61). The prime source from which to gain direction for the study of post-Reformation contra-cultures of religious significance is W. Stark, *The Sociology of Religion: A Study of Christendom,* Volume II (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967). He contends convincingly that all new modern religious cultures which have survived to operate effectively have embraced and lived out counter-views which have opposed uncompromisingly the views which the existing established culture had institutionalized to rigid form. He finds (see pp. 128-158) that this polarization of thought relates chiefly to differing views of learning, emotional expression, cleanliness, attire, manners, speech, food, drink, civic duties (public office, military service, oaths in courts of law, taxes), and theology. The use of these various sources will guide the reader to further works of merit which pursue the counter culture theme.

Conclusion

It remains only to speak summarily to the question posed by the title of this essay. Is the new explanation of youth which is making such a strong vibration over the nation a "revival", a "revolution", or a "historical replay" of something western culture has experienced before? Actually all three of these suggested characteristics are present in ways that issue warnings concerning the future. Unquestionably there is a turn toward religious revival, but of exotic, erotic eastern mysticism rather than of genuine Christian faith. It seems equally clear that there is

intent of revolution, for a new style of living is proposed the basic values of which are purposely meant to counter point by point the basic values of existing society. No less truly we are witnessing a historical replay — not in specifics, but in general form — of western society's faltering rhythm of moral relapse/moral recovery. Whether the upbeat will in this instance lead eventually to a more humane and expressive Christian culture will depend upon the guidance offered by mature minds fully acquainted with the up/down beat of western moral history. If adults abdicate this task of providing needed histroical perspective and place upon youth the sole responsibility of instituting societal change, they will be placing upon the young a role which their purely existential training has not prepared them to fulfil. History issues us many warnings that the present "feeling is all" approach is inadequate in itself to institute permanent beneficial change. As the latest lesson reminds, though youth are already too young to recall even this by experience, those who know only how "to feel" begin to think with their "body" and "blood". *Hitlerjugend* follow, then the holocaust. If we do not wish this to happen we must teach youth to maintain that delicate balance between the historical and existential that assures sane — and we trust — genuinely Christian culture.

[1]"San Francisco", written by John Phillips (copyright 1967 by Trousdale Music Publishing, Inc.).

[2]Statistics relating to the United States are taken from *Statistical Abstracts, 1970* (Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970); those relating to Canada from pamphlets 81-204, 81-220, 91-201 and 91-202 issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for 1969 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969).

[3]M. B. Bloy, "Alienated Youth, the Counter Culture, and the Chaplain", in *The Religious Situation, 1969* (ed. D. R. Cutler, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 649. This same source (pp. 649-650) notes the additional views of alienation mentioned in the remainder of the paragraph.

[4]"Alienated Youth: Introduction", *Journal of Social Issues,* XXV (April, 1969), 1.
Op. cit., p. 650.

[6]T. Roszak, *The Making of a Counter-Culture: Reflection on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969), p. 42, italics mine.

[7]H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church: A Chapter in the History of Renunciation* (4th ed.; London: Epworth Press, 1923), pp. 367-68.

[8]Bloy, *op. cit.,* p. 654.

[9]H. Toch, "Anatomy of a Hangup: Last Word on the Hippies", *Nation,* CCV (December 4, 1967), 582-88.

[10]A. J. Toynbee, "As It Was in Rome", *Horizon,* X (Spring, 1968), 26.

[11]D. P. Moynihan, "Nirvana Now", *American Scholar,* XXXVI (Autumn, 1967), 543, who quotes Halleck thus.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]*Ibid.,* p. 544.

[14]"From the '60s to the '70s", *Time,* December 19, 1969, p. 22.

[15]A. G. Gish, *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1970), pp. 17-20, provides other basic data on student background of New Left.

[16]J. L. Simmons and B. Winograd, *It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today* (Santa Barbara: Marc-Laird Publications, 1966), p. 135.

[17]*Ibid.*

[18]Moynihan, *op. cit.,* pp. 540-41.

[19] A. J. Moore, "The Revolt Against Affluence", *Religion in Life,* XXXVII (Winter, 1968), 509.

[20] S. Hall, "The Hippies: An American 'Moment' ", in J. Nagel, ed., *Student Power* (London: Marlin Press, 1969), p. 194; also Toch, *op. cit.,* pp. 582-83.

[21] Hall, *op. cit.,* pp. 198-202, gives an exceptionally fine account of this dialectic taking place between the expressionists and the activists.

[22] S. B. Chickering, "How We Got That Way", *Christian Scholar,* XXXVI (Autumn, 1967), 605.

[23] A. J. Toynbee, "On America", *Time Magazine,* December 8, 1967, p. 116.

[24] Gish, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 26.

[26] *Op. cit.,* pp. 539-40.

[27] See M. Rossman, "The Movement and Educational Reform", *Christian Scholar,* XXXVI (Autumn, 1967), 594-600, whose main points have been included in this summary of educational factors; also Roszak, *op. cit.,* pp. 45-47.

[28] For elaboration of points made see Chickering, *op. cit.,* p. 606; Moynihan, *op. cit.,* p. 546; Roszak, *op. cit.,* pp. 47-48; and N. K. Gottwald, "Hippies, Political Radicals, and the Church", *Christian Century,* LXXXIV (August 16, 1967), 1044-45.

[29] R. E. Cushman, "The Hippies in Theological Perspective", *Religion in Life,* XXXVII (Winter, 1968), 536-37.

[30] *Ibid.,* pp. 530-31.

[31] Simmons, *op. cit.,* pp. 8-9.

[32] Moore, *op. cit.,* p. 513.

[33] P. R. Woudenberg, "The Egoism of Flower Power", *Religion in Life,* XXXVII (Winter, 1968), 521-22.

[34] Roszak, *op. cit.,* p. 58.

[35] For elaboration of themes suggested in this paragraph see Hall, *op. cit.,* pp. 183, 189-190; Rossman, *op. cit.,* pp. 595-98; and Woudenberg, *op. cit.,* p. 519.

[36] Gish, *op. cit.,* p. 29.

[37] *Ibid.,* p. 44.

[38] Hall, *op. cit.,* pp. 181-84.

[39] Cushman, *op. cit.,* p. 535.

[40]J. D. Brown, ed., *The Hippies* (New York: By the correspondents of Time, Time Inc., 1967), p. 208.

[41]Roszak, *op. cit.,* pp. 134-137, which elaborates upon this adolescentization theme.

[42]*Ibid.,* p. 141.

[43]*Ibid.,* p. 140.

[44]*Ibid.,* pp. 142-44.

[45]Brown, *op. cit.,* p. 10.

[46]*Ibid.,* p. 102.

[47]D. L. Earisman, *Hippies in Our Midst: The Rebellion Against Rebellion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 11.

[48]For two such listings see Brown, *op. cit.,* pp. 217-220 and Simmons, op. cit., pp. 167-174. Of course new uses are being constantly added and old ones dropped.

[49]Bloy, *op. cit.,* p. 656.

[50]Roszak, *op. cit.,* pp. 38-9.

[51]Workman, *op. cti.,* p. 190 note.

[52]H. Smith, "Psychedelic Theophanies and the Religious Life", *Christianity and Crisis, XXVII* (June 26, 1967), 145, who credits the sayings to R. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York Harper Torch Books, 1956), pp. 51ff.

[53]Workman, *op. cit.,* pp. 148-52.

[54]*Ibid.,* pp. 130-48.

[55]*Ibid.,* pp. 177-81, 191-96.

[56]*Ibid.,* pp. 181-88.

[57]Moynihan, *op. cit.,* p. 541-42.

[58]Workman, *op. cit.,* pp. 172-75.

[59]*Ibid.,* pp. 157-170.

[60]J. Lacarriere, *Men Possessed of God: The Story of the Desert Monks of Ancient Christendom* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1964), p. 61.

[61]For more detail see W. Herberg, "Who Are the Hippies", *National Review, XIX* (August 8, 1967), 844-47; and P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950, c. 1910), II, 457-97.