

1970

God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews

Charles Brady S.M.
University of Dayton

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>

Recommended Citation

Brady, Charles S.M. (1970) "God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 7: No. 1, Article 7.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol7/iss1/7>

This Opinion or Commentary is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

God In The 70's: Selected Book Reviews

Rev. Charles Brady, S.M.

Though the 60's for the most part have slid nostalgically into the 70's, in the area of religion some think that the passing of the 60's should have been marked publicly by some broad, appropriate gesture like the washing of one's hands or the shaking of dust off one's feet. For, even if the 60's saw the reign of Pope John XXIII and the rise of ecumenism, they were also a time of upheaval, of Vatican II and of the death of God.

The radical, or death of God theologians, especially, caused quite a bit of pious consternation in the latter part of the 60's. The slogan "God is dead", which was about the only thing these theologies shared in common, burst upon the popular scene on the cover of TIME (Apr. 8, 1966). After a brief but hectic currency the slogan lost its popularity (TIME, May 2, 1969), and TIME has since announced that God may have been down, but He is definitely not out and is perhaps even making a comeback (Dec. 26, 1969).

It was recognized from the start that the slogan was used by the radical theologians not for its metaphysical accuracy but for its anti-establishment shock value. WILLIAM HAMILTON put it succinctly when he remarked that the slogan "was not soluble in holy water . . . even when uttered with extreme unction."¹ It was also recognized that to a certain extent the movement was the product of mass media. Its rise and fall was meteoric. There is a temptation, then, to write its disappearance off with a sigh of relief as of no consequence for the theology of the 70's. "Thank God we've seen the last of it!"

This would be to make a great mistake. There are already theologians who admit that they owe something to the movement. CARL E. BRAATEN, for example, in the preface of his new book *The Future of God* writes:

The "death of God" phase may have helped to force theology to find a new beginning. I am a partisan in this quest for a new way to start theology. Therefore, while I am unable to count myself, and few others would wish to number me, among the radical theologians, I feel myself closer to them than this book, or any of my other writings, can adequately indicate. Their questions are always in my mind. Their answers are always challenging those I prefer.²

Others find the slogan symptomatic of a very dangerous state of affairs for the Church. "God is dead" might have been the churchy equivalent of the little child's amused cry in the fairy tale *The Emperor's New Clothes*, "Mommy, look at that funny little man in his B.V.D.'s." For decades the Church had been ignoring the growing alienation between herself and the secular culture in which she was embedded. Once the cry "God is dead"

cut the air she could no longer ignore this. The game was up. The split was out in the open.

Moreover, because the cry came from within the Church itself from her theologians, another aspect of the alienation became painfully evident. Her membership had become acculturated to the secular environment. Alienation was inside as well as outside the Church. Christians themselves could no longer fully subscribe to the Christian message and make it a vital part of their lives. Pastors were speaking in an unintelligible language to parishioners who, unknown to themselves, were for the most part culturally conditioned to be unbelievers. The radical theologians sensed this and sounded their alarm.

In 1969 a number of books appeared in response to the set of problems raised by the radical theologians. This article will review some of the more important ones hopefully to provide some direction and grist for campus discussion of God in the 70's. For the purposes of this article the problems raised by the radical theologians may be grouped under four broad headings: 1) Facing up to the Implications of Secular Culture; 2) Finding New Ways of Speaking about God; 3) The Role of Jesus in Secular Theology; and 4) Celebration as a Way of Re-establishing Man's Relationship with God.

Books will be reviewed under one heading only although they might certainly touch on some of the other material. Full bibliographical information on them and other selected books will be given at the end of the article.

1. *Facing up to the Implications of Secular Culture*

SAM KEEN in *Apology for Wonder* maintains that man by default is responsible for his present strained relations with the divinity. Just as man can let the factories that supply his needs pollute his waters, foul his air, and bury him under a growing heap of refuse, so can man let patterns of culture develop that desensitize him and cut him off from that dimension of human experience called the wonderful, the holy. He shares this insight with other theologians. MARTIN BUBER had already written:

In our age the I-It relation, gigantically swollen, has usurped, practically uncontested, the mastery and the rule. The I of this relation, an I that possesses all, makes all, succeeds with all, this I that is unable to say Thou, unable to meet a being essentially, is the lord of the hour. This selfhood that has become omnipotent, with all the It around it, can naturally acknowledge neither God nor any genuine absolute which manifests itself to men as of non-human origin. It steps in between and shuts off from us the light of heaven.³

PAUL TILLICH spoke of the predicament of Western man, of his loss of the dimension of depth, and of his inability to ask the religious question passionately. He theorized:

How did the dimension of depth become lost? Like any important event, it has many causes, but certainly not the one which one hears often mentioned from ministers' pulpits and evangelists' platforms, namely, that a widespread impiety of

Brady: God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews

modern man is responsible The loss of the dimension of depth is caused by the relation of man to his world and to himself in our period, the period in which nature is being subjected scientifically and technically to the control of man. In this period, life in the dimension of depth is replaced by life in the horizontal dimension. The driving forces of the industrial society of which we are a part go ahead horizontally and not vertically. In popular terms this is expressed in phrases like "better and better," "bigger and bigger," "more and more." . . . If we now ask what does man do and seek if he goes ahead in the horizontal dimension, the answer is difficult. Sometimes one is inclined to say that the mere movement ahead without end, the intoxication with speeding forward without limits, is what satisfies him. But this answer is by no means sufficient. For on his way into space and time man changes the world he encounters. And the changes made by him change himself. He transforms everything he encounters into a tool; and in doing so he himself becomes a tool. But if he asks, a tool for what, there is no answer.⁴

In his earlier chapters KEEN describes what he means by the sense of wonder, its relation with a sense of the holy, and establishes the presence of this experience in past cultures. In chapter four, "The Chaotic World of Modern Man," he speaks of the destruction of the ecology of wonder, that is, of a loss of a fundamental feeling-response of man because of the loss of its supporting world-view through a radical change in Western man's self-understanding. In chapter five KEEN proposes the image of man as *homo faber* as the key to understanding modern man's self-identity.

Thus, to summarize both chapters, KEEN finds the emergence of the completely secular man who lives in a world that is a meaningless void. *Homo faber* in Promethean fashion has the utmost confidence in his ability to control the forces of his world and create a city in which he can live comfortably without God. Such a man must take upon his own shoulders the burden and privilege of creating the meaning of his life and providing the source of his own dignity. He does this by unfolding his powers, by working, by living productively. In the process he creates a functionalized world from which mystery, wonder, and the sense of intrinsic significance gradually disappear. KEEN following MARCEL suggests:

When the categories of function, efficiency, and output become central for identity, the result is alienation: the individual no longer feels himself to be a sacred nexus of life.⁵

Homo faber unwittingly destroys himself by taking himself too seriously and failing to come to terms with the connected notions of limit and gift, hence, with that mode of perceiving and celebrating creation which KEEN calls wonder.

KEEN's allegations might draw an angry reaction from scientists, technicians, and engineers that his analysis is unfair and onesided. In the short run, it is true, his analysis can be easily shrugged off, just as the question of air pollution can be shrugged off by someone who has never been to Los Angeles and never had his eyes water uncontrollably

a few minutes after having stepped outside his door, or who has never had the outdoor play of his children stopped by a smog alert, while the factories which produce the pollution grind merrily on.

KEEN's contentions may be better appreciated from the vantage point of another book, ERICH FROMM's *The Revolution of Hope*. Although FROMM is not treating precisely the same problem, he does comment on the direction our technological society is taking:

A specter is stalking in our midst whom only a few see with clarity. It is not the old ghost of communism or fascism. It is a new specter: a completely mechanized society, devoted to maximal material output and consumption, directed by computers; and in this social process, man himself is being transformed into a part of the total machine, well fed and entertained, yet passive, unalive, and with little feeling . . . In the search for scientific truth, man came across knowledge that he could use for the domination of nature. He had tremendous success. But in the onesided emphasis on technique and material consumption, man lost touch with himself, with life. Having lost religious faith and the humanistic values bound up with it, he concentrated on technical and material values and lost the capacity for deep emotional experiences, for the joy and sadness that accompany them. The machine he built became so powerful that it developed its own program, which now determines man's own thinking.⁶

Megamachine is the image FROMM uses to describe this totally organized and homogenized social system in which society functions like a machine and men like its parts.

Mankind's "one last green thing" – sex – is similarly threatened, if we believe the analysis of ROLLO MAY in *Love and Will*. Sex is dying from an excess of technique. To use MAY's picturesque terminology, modern man's difficulties may spring from the fact that he views himself as a "screwing machine."⁷

KEEN's final chapters exploring the possibilities of solution are not quite as successful as the ones that went before. Their burden is to show how necessary a sense of wonder is for man to maintain his balance as a human and to open him to the infinite. The thrust of these chapters can be summed up in KEEN's concluding quotation from DAG HAMMARSKJOLD:

God does not die on the day when we cease to believe in a personal deity, but we die on the day when our lives cease to be illumined by the steady radiance, renewed daily, of a wonder, the source of which is beyond all reason.⁸

Scientists, engineers, and businessmen will find the criticisms of KEEN and company unsympathetic, merciless, and one-sided. They might feel quite unwilling to think about them. However, it is precisely on the college campus where the two cultures can still intermingle that these vital questions should be debated. For in the long run what service does a Catholic university – or any university, for that matter – whose product in a very

real sense is the future, do for the Church and for the country, if it is content to produce specialists who meekly plug into the system and are in no way equipped to criticize or correct it?

2. *Finding New Ways of Speaking about God*

S. PAUL SCHILLING's *God in an Age of Atheism* comes as a welcome note of relief. It is not a "problem" book but an "answer" book. What is even more welcome, it can be read with gusto and considerable profit by the intelligent layman. The plan of the book is a simple one. In the first part SCHILLING traces the roots of the present religious situation back to the atheistic thinkers of the 19th century (Feuerbach, Marx, Lenin, Nietzsche). He then examines the thought of those thinkers closer to our situation, namely, Freud, the Existentialists, the scientific Humanists, the linguistic philosophers, Bloch, and the "Christian" atheists. He closes his survey with a section in which he lists in synthetic form the seven objections he believes to be the major bases of atheism in our time.

In the second part he proposes that the Christian thinker take the atheistic criticisms of God seriously. It is his contention that "the vigor, directness, and partial cogency of the atheistic reasoning"⁹ will force the Christian to speak forthrightly about God in a language the man of today can understand. After giving a pen portrait of the traditional picture of God as seen by the atheist, SCHILLING lists and develops eight proposals Christians should adopt if they would speak meaningfully of God today:

1. Our thought of God must be related intelligibly to all relevant knowledge gained from secular sources.
2. Christian thought should affirm unmistakably the intimate relationship of God to his world, which finds in him the ground and source of its unity, its manifold activity, and its ultimate meaning.
3. Our conception of the relation of God to man must maintain the real freedom and responsibility of man and the importance of his contribution to cosmic and historic processes.
4. God should be understood as other than and transcendent to all finite reality.
5. God should be conceived eschatologically, as he who opens before men a future, gives them a hope which outruns every present, and leads them toward the fulfillment of ever new possibilities.
6. Christian thought of God should now add to its historic affirmation of his eternity a frank acknowledgment of his temporality.
7. Christian thought should maintain the conception of God as Creator, with emphasis on his continuing creative activity, and recognition of human responsibility to share in creation.
8. God should be thought of as participating in the pathos and tragedy of existence, nevertheless keeping men in his invincible love and through suffering fulfilling his ends.¹⁰

In the last section he tries to speak concretely of God. His starting point is the meaning of God “as disclosed to and experienced by the Christian community in interaction with the rest of mankind.”¹¹ He does not start from a particular metaphysical position. Philosophy may aid in the project of describing divine reality, but no one concept borrowed from a particular philosophical position should play the determining role. He selects four concepts to help him clarify the meaning of the divine reality: being, process, love, and personality. In the final analysis SCHILLING doesn’t provide any new proofs for the existence of God or suggest any radical new ways of speaking about God, but he does alert the believer to his responsibility of speaking about God in a way that meets the needs of his friends who may be unbelievers.

Two other books address themselves to the problem of speaking about God, but on quite different levels. PETER L. BERGER, a professional sociologist, in *A Rumor of Angels* addresses himself as an intelligent and informed Christian to probing the question whether or not theological thinking is possible in our present situation. LANGDON GILKEY in *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language* asks much the same question from a highly technical point of view. Both authors start roughly from the same place to seek an anthropological basis for theologizing. BERGER explains:

I would suggest that theological thought seek out what might be called *signals of transcendence* within the empirically given human situation. And I would further suggest that there are *prototypical human gestures* that may constitute such signals. What does this mean?

By signals of transcendence I mean phenomena that are to be found within the domain of our “natural” reality but that appear to point beyond that reality. In other words, I am not using transcendence here in a technical philosophical sense but literally, as the transcending of the normal, everyday world that I earlier identified with the notion of the “supernatural.” By prototypical human gestures I mean certain reiterated acts and experiences that appear to express essential aspects of man’s being, of the human animal as such. I do *not* mean what Jung called “archetypes” — potent symbols buried deep in the unconscious mind that are common to all men. The phenomena I am discussing are not “unconscious” and do not have to be excavated from the “depths” of the mind; they belong to ordinary everyday awareness.¹²

Neither author attempts to produce a triumphalistic proof of the existence of God that must be accepted by all men of good will. Their intentions are more modest. They seek some minimum basis in human experience which for BERGER provides a rumor of the supernatural and for GILKEY validates the meaningfulness of God-talk. Thus BERGER in a chapter that is well worth reading speaks of four such signals, namely, man’s propensity for order, his capacity for joyful play, his ability to hope, and the judgment he passes on certain deeds as monstrously evil, which when explored may lead to the supernatural and, perhaps, beyond to God. GILKEY’s project needs to be examined in greater detail.

Brady: God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews

Naming the Whirlwind is, to my knowledge, the best buy of the 1969 theological crop. Thanks are due to Bobbs-Merrill for putting out such an important book in an inexpensive paperback edition. A word of caution, however, is in order. GILKEY writes out of a particular theological situation and addresses himself to a specific problem. His book is quite unlike some earlier and popular attempts to investigate radical theological thought.¹³

In the first part of his book, which is of general interest, GILKEY concurs with the radical theologians' criticism of past theological systems. He is grateful to them for "having smoked theologians out" of the positions and arguments framed by an older generation for past situations, and onto new ground. He writes:

In the radical theologians, therefore, we have protest against God-language on four related but significantly different grounds: the weakness of faith and the experience of the absence of God; the meaninglessness of all speech about reality as such, whether that speech be based on revelation or on metaphysical inquiry; the demonic character of the transcendent as a challenge to the joy and creativity of life; and finally, the impossibility, nay, the destructive immorality, of understanding historical evel on any other but naturalistic, radically secular terms. These protests are not by any means new to secular thought, but their appearance together as determinants of theological reflection create the new situation theologically.¹⁴

Later on he is more explicit:

In one sense or another, therefore, all of us in the contemporary situation find ourselves in a new theological "place," one in which the older theological methodologies – be they those of Thomas, Whitehead, and Hartshorne, or Brunner, Barth, Bultmann and the new hermeneuticists – are no longer directly helpful to us. For as they did in their time, so we must, if we are to talk of God at all, construct a theology that can move beyond the immediate. Unlike them, however, we can presuppose without careful argument neither the ultimate rationality of general experience nor the intelligibility and certainty to ourselves of the special faith encounter as the basis for that movement – neither the logos nor the logos made flesh. All of us must, therefore, ask new questions.¹⁵

The death of God theologians did attempt radical answers but according to GILKEY the inconsistencies and unsolved difficulties of their positions prevent them from providing creative theological answers to the problems of our secular age.

In the second part of *Naming the Whirlwind* he attempts an answer using the tools of phenomenology and linguistic analysis. More specifically, he addresses himself to what he considers to be *the* problem, proving the possibility of God-language in a secular time through a demonstration of its usefulness or meaningfulness and an elucidation of the conditions of its validity.¹⁶ Earlier he stated this in more rhetorical tones:

We are left, then, with the most important question of all: If God-language is

necessary for any Christian theology that is self-consistent, is God-language, and so Christian theology of any sort, possible and meaningful in a secular time? Is the general language game of religious discourse, of which Christian God-language is a particular example, applicable in secular existence; does it have any use there; do its symbols relevantly fit and so thematize our ordinary secular life? Or is the effort to understand out existence in terms of these sorts of symbols essentially meaningless, irrelevant, and opaque to those of us who share, whether we will or no, the cultural mood that we have described? Is humanism of some sort the only viable alternative of our time?¹⁷

Whether or not he succeeds in his attempt is a question that cannot be answered here. Theologians and philosophers will undoubtedly debate this in lengthier reviews. Suffice it to say that the second part is highly technical – though admirably structured – and is probably more suited to the graduate seminar than the Monday afternoon kaffeeklatch. The first part contains many valuable insights into and criticisms of the present theological situation and so will be of more use to a general audience. Those unfamiliar with the movements in Protestant thought mentioned will find useful background material in HEINZ ZÄHRNT's *The Question of God: Protestant Theology in the 20th Century*.

3. *The Role of Jesus in Secular Theology*

CARL E. BRAATEN in *The Future of God* gives a good example of how modern Protestant theology can stimulate Catholic thinking. BRAATEN follows the lead of three Continental theologians, Moltmann, Pannenberg, and Soelle¹⁸ and attempts a correlation between the eschatological origins of the Christian faith and the present revolutionary forces that seek to build a new and better future for mankind. The future, he believes, is a category that appeals to secular man, a category he can understand. In chapter three BRAATEN seeks to understand Jesus within this frame of reference:

The cross of Jesus represents the depths of God's love to us. The crucified Jesus is the presence of the future of God under the conditions of alienated existence. The coming kingdom of God's love pours itself into the cross, adopting it as the form of his presence in the midst of a suffering, dying, and godless world.¹⁹

A little later on he writes:

Jesus is the representative in whom God and man exchange hope for each other. Because of Jesus' cross God has a reason to hope for man; on account of Jesus' resurrection man has a reason to hope in God. For Jesus' sake we do not give up on God, and he does not give up on us. That means that Jesus has opened up the future for both God and man. He is ahead of us by being accepted into unity with the Father; he is ahead of God by advancing into our present in the form of suffering love.²⁰

Brady: God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews

Other presentations of Christ by modern Protestant theologians might be less favorably received by some Catholics. BRAATEN places his thought in a Trinitarian perspective: others don't. The phrase they find generally useful to describe Christ's relation to the divinity, "God was in Christ," doesn't necessarily mean that Christ was the Son of God in the Catholic sense. It may mean only that Christ was the focus of divine revelation and/or divine activity. In this case a key issue for these theologians and for the radical theologians is the Lordship of Christ. This issue may be stated in another way: "How does Christ who lived 2,000 years ago touch me, affect in any way at all my existence?"

One way explored to answer this question is the way of religious symbolism. Christ is a symbol through which God's meaning and power can come to us. JOHN CHARLES COOPER explains:

We can say precisely that symbols are locations of forms in which men become of the power of life that drives everything on through the dimension of time. The symbol is true if it conveys this power just as a water pipe is functional if it conveys water to us from the river. If the symbol brings vitality and life into our lives, it is true, it is good, and it is useful. If it does not bring such vitality to us, then the symbol is dead.²¹

He would maintain that Christ is such a symbol. Before the word "heresy" is whispered in heavy, cigar-laden accents, it should be remarked that the Catholic theologian is not faced with an either/or, namely, either Christ is the Son of God or he is only a symbol. It may have been that in the past Catholic theologians strongly emphasized the divinity of Christ almost to the exclusion of the existential dimension of his humanity, which, fortunately, has been the bread and butter of recent Protestants. Christ is divine, but since God did speak to man in Christ's human reality it is not in the least heretical to explore ways in which his human reality can speak to our human reality or can affect our human reality.

This bit of explanation will help to understand the Christ-symbol that emerges out of the next section.

4. *Celebration as a Way of Re-establishing Man's Relationship with God*

If, to some extent at least, the secular world we live in and the patterns of life established by secular society render the members of that society opaque, closed to the divine reality, it is evident that the believer must think seriously in the long run of changing or modifying these patterns and in the short run of rendering himself more open to the divine reality. How? by cultivating a sense of wonder, by reaching toward God implicitly in the celebration of human existence. If we are to avoid a plastic faith for plastic people, some contact must be made in our liturgies, whether they be the impromptu ones of the family or the ones we celebrate formally in church, with what is real, the source of being, as it expresses itself in sky, water, the eyes of a child, the person next to me, myself. Like Antaeus of old we weaken and are drained of life because we have lost contact with what is. A young man's impression of a church service hints at this:

What's wrong with the people in church?

What's the matter with them, Lord?

What happens to people
when they get inside a church?

Why do they change
and freeze up
when they get inside a church?
They don't seem to enjoy themselves
or talk to anyone.²²

HARVEY H. POTTHOFF in *God and the Celebration of Life* certainly has the right title but his book is much too general and popular with very little time given proportionately to an explicit treatment of celebration.

HARVEY COX in *The Feast of Fools*, a book that will be talked about, finds the right formula, even if part of it may be offensive to pious ears. He writes about God, festivity, fantasy, celebration — and Christ the harlequin, Christ the clown. Christ is the symbol of celebration, the leader of the dance:

Christ has come to previous generations in various guises, as teacher, as judge, as healer. In today's world these traditional images of Christ have lost much of their power. Now in a new, or really an old but recaptured guise, Christ has made an unexpected entrance onto the stage of modern secular life. Enter Christ the harlequin: the personification of festivity and fantasy in an age that had almost lost both. Coming now in grease-paint and halo, this Christ is able to touch our jaded modern consciousness as other images of Christ cannot.²³

To conclude, I think it would be fair to say neither God nor theology is dead for the Christian who is willing to rustle a few pages.

Footnotes: (For the sake of convenience the author's last name alone is given. Full information will be found in the accompanying bibliography.)

¹ HAMILTON, WILLIAM, "The Death of God," in PLAYBOY, Aug., 1966, p. 84. This article is in my opinion the best short example of a death of God theology.

² BRAATEN, p. 9.

³ BUBER, MARTIN, *Eclipse of God*, New York: Harper Torchbook, 1952, p. 129.

⁴ TILLICH, PAUL, "The Lost Dimension in Religion," in SATURDAY EVENING POST, June 14, 1958, p. 29 ff.

⁵ KEEN, p. 126.

⁶ FROMM, pp. 1-2.

Brady: God in the 70's: Selected Book Reviews

- ⁷ MAY, ROLLO, *Love and Will*, New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1969, pp. 59 and 56.
- ⁸ HAMMARSKJOLD, DAG, *Markings*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964, 56.
- ⁹ SCHILLING, p. 115.
- ¹⁰ SCHILLING, pp. 137-190.
- ¹¹ SCHILLING, p. 193.
- ¹² BERGER, pp. 65-66.
- ¹³ Cp. HAMILTON, KENNETH, *God is Dead: The Anatomy of a Slogan*, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1966 or MONTGOMERY, JOHN WARWICK, *The 'Is God Dead?' Controversy*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1966.
- ¹⁴ GILKEY, p. 145.
- ¹⁵ GILKEY, p. 227.
- ¹⁶ GILKEY, p. 232.
- ¹⁷ GILKEY, p. 231.
- ¹⁸ SOELLE, DOROTHEE, *Christ the Representative*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, (ET) 1967.
- ¹⁹ BRAATEN, p. 87.
- ²⁰ BRAATEN, p. 91.
- ²¹ COOPER, p. 31.
- ²² HABEL, NORMAN C., *For Mature Adults Only*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press Paperback, 1969, p. 54. This is an excellent book for tuning into the religious moods of teenagers.
- ²³ COX, p. 139.

List of Recommended Books:

- BERGER, PETER L., *A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural*, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1969, \$4.50.
- BRAATEN, CARL E., *The Future of God: The Revolutionary Dynamics of Hope*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, \$5.95.
- BURKLE, HOWARD R., *The Non-Existence of God: Antitheism from Hegel to Dumery*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1969, \$5.95.
- CAUTHEN, KENNETH, *Science, Secularization, and God*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1969, \$5.50.
- COBB, JOHN B., Jr., *God and the World*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969, \$2.95. Professor David Griffin of the Department of Theological Studies assisted Dr. Cobb in the preparation of this book.
- COOPER, JOHN CHARLES, *The New Mentality*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969, \$2.65.

University of Dayton Review, Vol. 7 [1970], No. 1, Art. 7

COX, HARVEY, *The Feast of Fools: A Theological Essay on Festivity and Fantasy*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969, \$5.95.

COOPER, JOHN CHARLES, *The New Mentality*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969, \$2.65.

FACKRE, GABRIEL, *Humiliation and Celebration: Post-Radical Themes in Doctrine, Morals and Mission*, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969, \$6.95.

FROMM, ERICH, *The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology*, New York: Bantam Paperback, 1968, \$.95.

GIBSON, ARTHUR, *The Silence of God: Creative Response to the Films of Ingmar Bergman*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, \$2.25 (paperback edition).

GILKEY, LANGDON, *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language*, Indianapolis: 1969, \$2.75.

HAMILTON, NEILL Q., *Jesus for a No-God World*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969, \$6.50.

KEEN, SAM, *Apology for Wonder*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, \$5.95.

MAGUIRE, JOHN DAVID, *The Dance of the Pilgrim: A Christian Style of Life for Today*, New York: Association Press, 1967, \$1.75.

MERTON, THOMAS, *Faith and Violence*, Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame Press, 1968, \$1.95. The latter part of the book is devoted to Merton's reaction to the radical theologians. Excellent.

POTTHOFF, HARVEY H., *God and the Celebration of Life*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, \$6.95.

RAHNER, KARL, *Do You Believe in God?*, New York: Newmann Press, 1969, \$3.95.

ROSS, JAMES F., *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, New York: Macmillan Paperback, 1969, \$1.95.

SCHILLING, S. PAUL, *God in an Age of Atheism*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1969, \$5.50. Ample bibliography.

STRINGFELLOW, WILLIAM, *Impostors of God: Inquiries into Favorite Idols*, Dayton: George A. Pflaum, 1969, \$.85. Good for discussion groups.

VINCENT, JOHN J., *Secular Christ: A Contemporary Interpretation of Jesus*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1968, \$4.95.

ZAHRNT, HEINZ, *The Question of God: Protestant Theology in the 20th Century*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966 (ET 1969), \$8.75.

Note: The price listed is the one given on the dust jacket.