pastoral care in response to what may well be a new social disease — a disease that may be afflicting many of us already — the malady of future shock.

E.E.T.

Frederick C. Kuether, 1911-1971: A Tribute

In a simple memorial service for Frederick C. Kuether at the Marble Collegiate Church in New York City, C. Clifford McLaughlan, a colleague on the staff of the American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry, concluded his remarks by saying, “I know Fred is dead, though it is difficult to focus on that. But what can never die is the memory of his warmth, his sensitivity, his ability to understand, his readiness to be and let be, his greatness as a human being, a teacher, a supervisor, a leader, a colleague and a loyal friend.” In the dimension of Fred’s being and his ability to let others be, we find the clue both to our personal loss and to the special place of Frederick C. Kuether in the development of clinical pastoral education and pastoral counseling in the Twentieth Century.

The most frequently cited interpretation of the evolution of clinical pastoral education is that the movement began with a concern about what one must do to minister and turned next to the question of what one must know in order to minister. Under Boisen and others of the 1920’s and 1930’s these questions were answered by doing the work of orderlies in hospitals and knowing the case histories of the patients one would serve. In response to Carl Rogers, the central preoccupation became in the 1940’s what must I say. Client-centered ways of saying remain prominent in the clinical pastoral training of many beginning students today. A higher stage of development is ushered in with the minister’s discovery that the decisive question is who may I be to this person. Few who recite the above formula for professional growth remember that it was authored originally by Frederick C. Kuether (in a 1953 issue of Pastoral Psychology), or that it is his personal-professional autobiography in outline.

Beginning his career in clinical pastoral training in 1934 with Anton Boisen at Elgin State Hospital, Fred served as chaplain supervisor at the Federal Reformatory in Chillicothe, Ohio, at the St. Charles School for Boys in Illinois and at Cook County Hospital in Chicago before moving to New York City as Director of the Council for Clinical Training, Inc., in 1947. During these years Fred worked through the do, know and say stages of his professional development. He was a radical churchman. He and most of his colleagues in the Council were seeking, as Fred once said, to save their own souls through defiance of the conventions. Within months of his becoming Director of the Council, Kuether faced an issue that became the Great Divide for the organization and possibly for himself. A member of the inner circle of leadership had offended. A Fall Conference at Perkiomen, Pennsylvania became the setting for a drama
that was focused in Fred Kuether's internal struggle over how to deal with the brother. Not that Fred alone wrestled with the decision, but that in him it was most acute for he was the leader. He was a rebel leader of a rebel band and the issue was to define the limits of rebellion. The drama of that week has been re-played by many other leaders of even more radical groups, but then as now the decision for the leader remains a solitary one and upon it the future of the movement takes form. Fred and the Council brothers with him wept at Perkiomen for the dissolution of their fraternity of rebels as they became a professional organization. By 1956 when Fred resigned as Director of the Council many of the supervisors who were in the group in 1947 had left it. Those who remained and those who joined them entered the main stream of theological education. It was a slow and torturous journey but one made a little bit easier because Fred Kuether was in the company.

On April 25, 1968 Frederick C. Kuether was presented the Fourth Annual Distinguished Contribution Award by the American Association of Pastoral Counselors, Inc. In response, he spoke on the theme: "Pastoral Counseling: a Second Commitment." Fred’s commitment to pastoral counseling developed during the early 1950’s concurrent with his discovery of the importance of being in ministry. It took form when he accepted the post of Director of Training for the American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry in 1954. His “second” commitment led him to be one of the prime initiators of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors in 1962 just as his “first” commitment had led him to accept responsibility for the Council for Clinical Training in 1947.

Many of us have followed the path that Fred Kuether beat out. We have begun in clinical pastoral education and gone into pastoral counseling. We have begun in rebellion and painfully, often cautiously, entered professional establishments. We have integrated the disciplines of ministry to persons in crisis with the demands of training other clergymen for such a ministry and we have built on a foundation of clinical pastoral education the specialization of psychotherapy. But Fred Kuether was first. He was not first in point of time necessarily, but he was a prime mover. He was first in terms of the quality, the durability and the significance of his contribution both to clinical pastoral education and to pastoral counseling. Fred paid a large price for the cause of ministry. He mastered the conceptual tools of personality theory and psychotherapy; he invested in extended supervised training and he paid the price of intensive personal psychotherapy. In addition to a heavy case load and extensive training responsibilities, he gave himself generously to his peers in the context of both the Council for Clinical Training and the American Association of Pastoral Counselors. No one else seems to us to embody so completely the polarities, the process of maturation and the brilliance of clinical performance that characterize the last four decades of Christian ministry in its alliance with the behavioral scientists and the psychotherapists.
We believe that Cliff McLaughlan is right, that death cannot finally overcome Fred Kuether’s warmth, his sensitivity, his ability to understand or his readiness to be and let be. He was, to be sure, just a man for all this. But a man to be honored in memory and emulated in ministry now and in the years to come.

E.E.T.

International Editors Join Journal

Welcome Heije Faber and Narcisco Dumalagan to our staff of Editors. Heije Faber of Holland is known to many of our readers as the author of *The Art of Pastoral Conversation* (Abingdon, 1962) and *Pastoral Care and Clinical Training in America* (Arnhem, 1961). I met him in 1963 on a visit to Leyden, and was a lecturer in the first clinical pastoral training program in Holland that summer. Heije has been professor at the University of Leyden but is moving to a Catholic University in Southern Holland in the fall. Chaplain Dumalagan of St. Luke’s Hospital, Manila, is less well known but comes highly recommended by those who know him and have worked with him in the new Philippine Association for Clinical Pastoral Care. Each editor will bring us news from his part of the world, channel articles from other authors to our readers and represent us at the developing conferences and pastoral associations in Europe and Asia. Clinical pastoral education and pastoral counseling have become international. The appointment of these International Editors will make that fact evident to us.

C.W.S.

Conflict in a Future-Shocked Church

We are caught up in a social revolution caused by our achievement in science and technology and the increasing secularization of life. Although these factors have been affecting economic life for at least 75 years, their influence on social and personal values was not appreciatively recognized before World War II. With the war came the loss of the dream that Americans through hard work and conscious effort could avoid the violent international conflicts of the past and build a utopian society. The introduction of the atomic bomb made Americans aware that their future, indeed the future of all civilization, was now held in a thin balance against the ever pressing possibility of total extinction. Finally, rapid mass mobility and sophisticated media systems sufficiently reshaped American life so that persons became free to order their lives around time rather than distance and their sense of identity around knowledge rather than property.

These changes have made all areas of American life increasingly vulnerable to criticism. Social, political, religious and economic structures are no longer analyzed as to their stability and continuity with the past, but as to their adaptability to the pressures and movements of modern technological society. Institutions, like individuals, are in a state of future shock. The criticisms being raised concern the abilities of these in-