with material things. I would suggest that pluralism, a world infinitely larger than Johnson's London, a lack of stylistic training, and just plain lack of interest are some of the general reasons why we may notice a lack of religious art today, or a breach between religion and art. Actually, we have had a good deal of religious art in this century, in spite of this "split" Clark deplores. He mentions enough of it in his essay to slightly contradict the supposed need for a "re-merger."

We do not need a "marriage" of religion and art in order to get great religious art, art that enriches the spirit. As I have tried to point out, it is doubtful if such a marriage ever existed, and the dichotomy has tended to be a creative, rather than a deadening thing. If both the men of the arts and the men of religion are doing their best jobs, this gulf will be spanned naturally, by artists who are capable and worthy of both worlds, who claim the right to speak freely, even of religion, just as the men of religion assume the right to criticize the arts and the artists. Unlike Dr. Clark, I am not "uncomfortable with the dichotomy," nor am I as disturbed by the market place — but I leave this latter problem to better hands. I recognize that both the artist and the man of religion — and the businessman they so often satirize or rebuke — lose something by their concentrations. Judged in terms of the possible results of their labors, it is often something well worth losing. The religious man may lose his humanity, the artist his exaltation, and the businessman his mind, but these are the risks one takes. To assume that life can be lived without taking them, to hope that some sort of "merging" or marriage of disciplines will solve problems, is to believe in an illusion.

IN DEFENSE OF THE MARKET PLACE

Gary H. Driggs

Professor Clark's "Art, Religion, and the Market Place" takes us into a very interesting world in which Art and Religion (the good guys) are engaged in a deathly struggle with the Market Place (the bad guy). Unfortunately, art and religion have not seen, in Professor Clark's world, the need to unify and are currently losing their struggle against the awesome power of the market place. The first difficulty is to determine exactly what the market place is. Professor Clark describes it as excluding the legitimate function of supplying and distributing human needs but extends it to mean materialism and all its various manifestations — from the moneychangers in the

temples to a belief in the materialistic universe, or, as far as that goes, to nearly everything which is bad or evil.

To indicate that one accepts legitimate functions of distributing and supplying human needs leaves more questions unanswered than answered. Who is to determine what is a "legitimate" human need, and when does one leave the area of legitimate human needs and move into the arena of materialistic excesses? To say that one is against excesses is hardly controversial or significant. One could quickly agree that nearly everybody is against excesses and that could be the end of the discussion.

However, Professor Clark is not so much against excesses in the market place as he is against the basic objectives and functioning of an economic system which attempts to emphasize the production of goods and services and to stimulate human needs and desires for a higher and increasing standard of living. It has been the very materialistic drive of the market place — which Professor Clark so deplores — which has driven men on to innovations, inventions, improved methods, products, advertising and so on; all of which have been the great push behind economic growth. While Professor Clark favors supplying legitimate human needs, he fears and distrusts the market place. Material things, goods, money, contracts, factories, and the like are all basically defiled, and art and religion should join forces in "defeating" them. Man is pictured as trapped in a mechanistic universe where the workings of the economic system and its emphasis on increasing wealth make it impossible for him to enjoy either the beauties of art or the spirituality of religion.

Not only do I find difficulty in understanding Clark's meaning of the term "market place," but the words "art" and "religion" also seem vague. Art apparently includes literature, painting, sculpture, and music; but does it include architecture, design in commercial products, journalism, or site planning? Does religion include all religions, Christianity, Judaism, or simply "true religion"?

ENEMY OR FRIEND?

Professor Clark asserts that the most persistent enemy of art is the market place. This is proved by reference to Jason, who secures his position in the kingdom by marrying the king's daughter, and to Macbeth's ambition for power and position. However, do these involve the market place? Greed is not a characteristic unique to the market place or economic system unless one defines the market place to include all sin, and art and religion as being devoid of it. Professor Clark manages to ignore conveniently the fact that a large percentage of the great art and music in past ages was sponsored by

patrons who used market-place earnings to subsidize artists and musicians. A visit to the Old Masters' section of any large museum suggests that the market place and art were more of a partnership than opponents in a state of war. However, Professor Clark is finally able to make his point by falling back on *Walden,* which is "one long denial of the market place and one long hymn to the life of the spirit." It is true that Thoreau rejects the market place in *Walden,* or at least rejects it for a little while. However, Thoreau did manage to take a few provisions from a smoothly functioning economic system and was willing to return to it after he had found sufficient solitude.

While all of us enjoy the pleasure of criticizing the problems of a materialistic and complicated world, we at the same time like to enjoy the comforts of an advanced economic system. Few of us are willing to go back to a primitive society where nearly all of the goods which the family used were produced by its own hands. We all enjoy the fruits of a system which has increased productivity to the point where only a small portion of our total working time is involved in obtaining basic food and clothing for our families. Much of our time can now be spent in the pleasures of reading, visiting art museums, going to church, or in many other discretionary pursuits. All this is made possible by an economic system in which there are not winners or losers in each transaction, but in which both parties to a transaction benefit; a system in which increasing productivity has brought the time near when poverty can be largely eliminated. While the artist may see, as Clark suggests, the distorted market-place emphasis as the "enemy" to the life of the spirit, there are many of us who feel that the development of a highly advanced economic system has made it possible for the life of the spirit to be enjoyed by an ever-increasing segment of the population. Never before in history have the "Great Books" — the literary classics — been available to so many people at such a small cost, never before has education been so accessible, and never before has art ownership and enjoyment been so widespread. Today the opportunity to listen to "live" symphony orchestras is available to nearly everyone in this country. This is all made possible by the market place with its materialistic emphasis and the resultant increase in productivity.

It is certainly true that the market place contains excesses, including those humorously, though ironically, pointed out by Twain. Faulkner and Eliot paint some very depressing scenes of man's condition and one must deplore the excesses of Babbittry depicted by Sinclair Lewis. However, it is in modern society, with all of its materialistic manifestations, that one sees the overwhelming response

of Americans to serve in the Peace Corps, the billions of dollars expended by the country in foreign aid to help less fortunate countries, and the rapid growth of foundations established by people made wealthy by the market place — foundations which devote their time and energy to the betterment of art, music, and literature, and the elimination of disease. Many of the great museums in the country, such as the National Gallery in Washington and others, were largely made possible through donations by individuals, corporations, and foundations which attained materialistic success in the market place. While these foundations and other benefits of the market place do not absolve it of excesses or errors, they suggest that the materialistic developments of the market place have not universally led society to lower and lower levels.

Professor Clark views with alarm the possibility of a sell-out by art and religion to the market place. He abhors the undeclared hostility between various departments in our universities. In this I think he has a point, but it is taken in the wrong direction. Often one of the great hostilities within a university is held by the liberal arts departments towards the business school. A business major who is encouraged by his department chairman to spread out and broaden his experience by courses in art or literature is frequently met in the classroom by a sarcastic remark from the humanities professor about business majors and their insensitivity to the finer things in life. A question raised in class by such a student may often find the response, "That is the sort of question a business major might raise." In spite of this kind of hostility, it is interesting to note that nearly all schools of business include courses on literature or art in special programs which they plan for businessmen. In many cases, the school of business on the campus is offering the olive branch to the liberal arts departments, asking for help in finding a more meaningful way to develop the economic system. Schools of business are increasing their emphasis on human values in business and the need for objectives other than profit. However, many academic people in the liberal arts share Professor Clark's view that there is to be no accommodation with the market place. The moneychangers of the market place defile art, as they see it.

Perhaps we should resign ourselves to hostility between departments within a university. Within the typical business firm, there is almost continuous hostility between the marketing department, production department, and financial department. The efficiency of a business firm is often enhanced by the productive criticism and controversy which comes from the battle between the departments. Within the university context, we might also hope that controversy,

dialogue, and discussion between departments may lead to a deeper understanding by each of its strong points and weaknesses. In a business firm, the manager arbitrates between the departments and forces cooperation in order to produce the product at a profit. In the university, we are also attempting to produce meaningful products in our graduates, but I believe we sometimes fall short in the quality and balance of our graduates due to our failure to make our inter-departmental controversies productive and meaningful.

The notion seems to prevail generally among academic people in the liberal arts areas that somehow people who pursue art, literature, or music are a little more righteous and are contributing just a little more to human development than someone who follows a market-place occupation, such as selling bonds. Professor Clark seems to suggest that, while it would be without question that a composer of music, a painter of pictures, or a writer of prose should and could ask for God's blessings in his activities, it somehow seems sacrilegious for a vacuum cleaner salesman or a bond dealer to be able to send a supplication to God as he goes about his activities. However, one is prompted to think of Paul's admonitions in Corinthians, wherein he suggests that no part of the body can appropriately indicate that it has no need for another part. For a society to function with a well-rounded and balanced program, it requires vacuum cleaner salesmen, bond dealers, writers, musicians, janitors, and artists. I have yet to find statistical or other evidence suggesting that artists, writers, or musicians are inherently more righteous than storekeepers, vacuum cleaner salesmen, or even bankers.

While it is certainly not appropriate to translate religion into another market-place tool and function, it does not seem completely inappropriate to bring into religion terms that people can grasp and understand. Most people spend the majority of their time pursuing their source of livelihood. A person's job usually takes more of his waking hours than religion, recreation, or family. Thus, with some logic religious teachers have tried to translate religion into terms which are understandable and also into terms which could be applied during the time a person is working at his occupation. Religion must not only be meaningful as we are enjoying a spiritual experience at a testimony meeting or as we view a great work of art; but religion must also be a continuing, meaningful expression as one goes about his daily work and his usual contacts with other people.

It seems at times that one of the things Professor Clark is really objecting to is the increased institutionalization of our activities both in the market place and in religion. As a society becomes more urbanized and structured, much of an individual's efforts and activity

becomes confined to his specialized role in turning one of the cogs in the economic system or, so far as that is concerned, in a religious organization. This increased institutionalization requires emphasis on the monthly statistical report and the cold, impersonal decisions that often flow from large corporations or institutions. Nearly everyone would agree that increased urbanization and institutionalization of society causes problems in allowing people to attain their full expression, but it also brings opportunities and blessings, such as increased standards of living, closer contact with universities, museums, art galleries, cultural programs, and recreational facilities.

TREASURES OF THE MARKET PLACE

To Professor Clark it is irony that treasures of art have become treasures of the market place. This is not a purely modern phenomenon, that art through the ages has been supported by the wealthy, the corporations, the controllers of the economic system. Today, as in the past, much of the great art and beauty in the world is being created by the market place. The new towns being built near Los Angeles, Washington, and other cities are employing new concepts of urban planning, with increased emphasis on landscaping and high-quality architecture. Many of the buildings built by institutions and corporations are truly works of art in their design and layout. Many corporations install in their offices works of art which afford the general public unprecedented opportunities to enjoy the beauty which art can create. In nearly every major city there are at least one or two examples of great beauty and art expressed in business buildings and their accompanying art objects. In fact, I think it is probably appropriate to suggest that many of the products which we use (such as furnishings, appliances, and transportation vehicles) express in themselves a quality of art and design not available at any previous time.

I disagree with Professor Clark that the market place has purchased far too much of art and religion. I would argue, on the contrary, that we should seize every opportunity to make the market place and the economic system in which we live more beautiful through greater emphasis on art and religion. Professor Clark, I think, has an excellent point in his suggestion that art and religion should join forces in uplifting man to a higher level of achievement and spirituality. Religion, art, music, literature — beautiful things wherever they are found — can join together in helping man come to terms with himself. As President McKay has so often suggested, the greatest battles are fought within the depths of man's own soul.