

5-1-1968

Theology, News and Notes - Vol. 14, No. 03

Fuller Theological Seminary

George Eldon Ladd

James S. Hewett

Paul King Jewett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/tnn>

 Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fuller Theological Seminary; Ladd, George Eldon; Hewett, James S.; and Jewett, Paul King, "Theology, News and Notes - Vol. 14, No. 03" (1968). *Theology News & Notes*. 31.

<https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/tnn/31>

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Fuller Seminary Publications at Digital Commons @ Fuller. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theology News & Notes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact archives@fuller.edu.

Theology News and Notes

PUBLISHED FOR THE FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY ALUMNI

In This Issue...

The Alumni Fund	Page 2
Letter from the Editor	Page 2
The Christian and the State, <i>George E. Ladd</i>	Page 3
Disillusioned Pacifist, <i>James Hewett</i>	Page 7
Observations on Atlanta, <i>Paul K. Jewett</i>	Page 10
The Old Testament and Worship Today, <i>David A. Hubbard</i>	Page 11
Thou Shalt Not Something or Other.....	Page 13
Book Reviews	Page 14
Class Notes	Page 15
Books for Review	Page 15
Placement Opportunities	Page 16



The faculty of the School of World Mission at Fuller is shown with Fuller alumni working on the master of arts in missions degree. Front row: Dr. Ralph D. Winter, associate professor of missionary techniques and methods; Dr. Alan R. Tippett, professor of missionary anthropology; Dr. Donald A. McGavran, dean; Dr. Jack Shepherd, visiting professor of the theory of mission and candidate secretary of the Latin American Mission. Back row: Leonard Tuggy, B.D. '56, serving with the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society in the Philippines; Wayne Weld, B.D. '62, serving with the Evangelical Covenant Church in Ecuador; Ted Ailanjian, B.D. '51, serving in the Ivory Coast under the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society; Vernon Tank, B.D. '63, serving with the Mustard Seed Board in Taiwan; and C. Peter Wagner, B.D. '55, field secretary of the Andes Evangelical Mission in Bolivia.

These titles are recommended by the ministry faculty for those involved in the preaching task:

Catholic Theology in Dialogue, by Gustave Weigel, S.J., Harper and Bros., 126 pp., \$2.75, 1960.

A Brief History of Preaching, by Yngve Brilioth, Fortress Press, 229 pp., \$2.95, 1965.

New Directions in Theology Today, Vol. 3, God and Secularity, by John Macquarrie, Westminster Press, 157 pp., \$1.95.

Introduction to Hermeneutics, by Rene Marle, Herder and Herder, 128 pp., \$4.50, 1967.

A Varied Harvest, by Frank E. Gaebelin, Eerdmans Publishing Co., 198 pp., \$4.95, 1967.

Christian Reflections, by C. S. Lewis, Eerdmans Publishing Co., 176 pp., \$3.95, 1967.

These books, those reviewed or listed for review in this issue of *Theology News and Notes*, and other titles of your choice are available through the Seminary Bookstore at student discount rates.

Fuller Seminary Bookstore
135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101

Please send me these titles and bill me accordingly (include name of author and publisher, if you have them):

Name _____

Address _____

The Alumni Fund

STATUS REPORT

Goal	\$12,000
Total Paid to Date	11,089
Balance Due on Commitments	829
Total Cash and Balance of Commitments	11,918

NOTES

- Fashion note: Little change in men's pockets this year.
- Prefer to meet goal by many alumni giving smaller gifts than a few giving larger gifts.
- Hopeful that each alumnus will pray about the Fuller Alumni Fund.
- Nothing wrong with exceeding goal.
- Gifts are good stewardship of the Lord's money.
- Grateful for your gift!

From the Editor

It has been our pleasure during the past several months to be involved in the publication of *Theology News and Notes*. May we thank you for this opportunity, and for bearing with us. We have many ideas, but only so much time to put them together. Some things have come off almost as we planned, while others have sometimes admittedly fallen short.

As a result of the new format, more alumni have been inclined to keep the Alumni Office informed of news for the class notes section, which is gratefully received. But may we encourage you also to submit articles, or correspond with us on ideas for major editorial material.

This issue has two articles on war. It was our original intention to have the emphasis of the whole issue on war, and specifically on the various views of the Vietnam War. May we solicit your participation so that the July issue can carry this out. Items should be received by June 20.

Theology News and Notes

Volume XIV, No. 3, May 1968

A publication of Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 North Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101. Published six times a year in January, March, May, July, September, and December. Second class postage paid at Pasadena, California.

James W. Hagelanz, *Editor*
Bernice F. Spencer, *Managing Editor*

The editorial content of *Theology News and Notes* reflects the opinions of the various authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the views of Fuller Theological Seminary trustees and faculty.

The Christian and the State

by George Eldon Ladd
Professor of New Testament Theology and Exegesis

DOES THE BIBLE GUIDE US in our relationship to the state and participation in war?

While it doesn't spell out a comprehensive social ethic that gives easy and ready-made answers for today's social problems, it does give us fundamental principles.

The most casual reading of our Lord's Olivet Discourse in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 makes it clear that it is not the business of Jesus' disciples to build a society free from the plagues of social evil and war. War and turmoil will persist to the end of time; only the return of our Lord in power to complete His work will ultimately solve the evils of a fallen social order. The primary task of the Christian and of the church of Jesus Christ is to proclaim the gospel of the kingdom in all the world until the coming of the end (Matthew 24:14).

Does this mean, as many Christians seem to assume, that the Christian has no interest in social issues? Two passages from the New Testament throw light on the relationship between the Christian and the state.

TAXES

In the twelfth chapter of Mark, certain of Jesus' enemies tried to trap Him with a question: "Teacher, we know that you are true and care for no man; for you do not regard the position of men, but truly teach the way of God. Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not? Should we pay them, or should we not?"

This was a potentially explosive question. Zealous Jews believed that only God had the moral right to receive gifts of money from His people, and that taxes paid to the support of the Roman Empire were a necessary concession to the evil character of the world. Therefore, when Jesus asserted that it was proper to pay taxes to support the military might of Rome and its power structure, it sounded as if he was denying the sovereign rights of God.

On the other hand, to deny the right of Caesar to collect taxes even from the Jews would be interpreted by the partisans of the court of Herod, the king of Galilee, as implicit sedition. Read superficially, Jesus' answer appears to avoid the issue; but in reality it embodies a profound theology. Asking for a coin used to pay such taxes, He said to them,

"Whose likeness and inscription is this?" They answered, "Caesar's." Jesus said to them, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

In this statement Jesus shows that we have responsibility in two different spheres of existence: human government and divine government. Each has its legitimate claims which we must meet. Caesar, the representative of human government, has legitimate claims which are represented by the obligation to pay taxes. The briefest reflection will remind us that the Roman state was not a Christian state, or a theocracy like Old Testament Israel. Religiously, it was polytheistic; and politically, its sovereignty was sustained by brute force. Military legions at the borders of the Mediterranean world held back the barbarians, made possible a stable civilization and produced an extended period of peace, the famous *Pax Romana*.

Even though it was a pagan, warlike state, said Jesus, the Roman government held legitimate claims over all of its citizens, even over the people of God. Since law and order were preserved by Roman force, even God's people were obligated to contribute to its support.

It is obvious that the claims of God must be of a higher order than the claims of Caesar, although this is not stated in the words of Jesus. The church father Tertullian said, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's—his image on the coin; give to God what is God's—His image in man, yourself." Jesus' statement implies that when the claims of Caesar are properly carried out, they will not transgress the claims which God has upon His creatures. We may conclude that the claims of the state are legitimate and right within their proper boundaries.

DEMONIC POWER

Another element in the teachings of our Lord places the power of the political order in a different light and suggests something of the demonic power behind political power. The principle embodied in human authority is a different principle than that embodied in the kingdom of God. "You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among

you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all" (Mark 10:42-44). The temptation to use power in an arbitrary and oppressive way as the mere assertion of authority is an implicitly evil principle. Human government should issue in the well-being of its citizens, but it can easily lead to the aggrandizement of the rulers and the oppression of the ruled. Rome aimed to be mistress of the world, not merely that the world might receive her benefits, but that Rome might have greater glory. Jesus rejected this principle of greatness: Power for power's sake was evil.

A demonic element behind the political structure is even more evident in the account of Jesus' temptation. Satan showed Jesus, probably in imagination, all the kingdoms of the world, and said to Him, "All these things will I give you if you will fall down and worship me" (Matthew 4:9). The meaning of this passage will be clearer when we discuss the same tension in Paul's writing.

PAUL ON GOVERNMENT

In Romans 13:1-7, Paul lays down four fundamentals in the Christian relationship to the state, even a pagan one like Rome.

First, human government as such is a divine institution. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God (Romans 13:2). Biblical theology presents two different orders of divine reality: the order of creation and the order of redemption. Ultimately, God is sovereign lord over both orders. Although He sustains a special relationship to His people through the redemption achieved by Christ, God is at the same time Lord of the universe. As its creator and sustainer, He has ordained the principle of human government as a means of providing law and order. This is true of a pagan state as well as of a Christian state. Therefore, "he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed" (Romans 13:2). The power exercised by the human state is a derived power from God, and rests on divine sanctions.

Second, since the state derives its authority from divine sanction, God requires obedience and submission of its citizens, especially Christian citizens. Citizens obey not merely because the state has the power to enforce obedience, but "for the sake of conscience" (vs. 5). Disobedience to the state is therefore disobedience to the will of God. A Christian citizen cannot have a good conscience toward God and be deliberately disobedient to the structure of law and order.

A *third* principle limits the objective of divinely appointed government: good order. The divinely ordained purpose accomplished through human government is human justice; the primary emphasis is placed on the punishment of the wrongdoer, so the one who pursues good conduct has nothing to fear. When Paul says that if one does what is good he

will receive the state's approval (vs. 3), he can hardly be thinking of any specific concrete rewards, but of the blessings of freedom from oppression, and peace and tranquility to pursue one's affairs.

A *fourth* principle lays down the basis of law and order: the sword. "He does not bear the sword in vain" (vs. 4). The sword was the symbol of Roman authority on the local level through civil magistrates, and on the worldwide level through the Roman armies. In these words, God's Word clearly establishes the principle of force as the basis for human law and order. At root, it makes little difference whether this force is exercised through local police punishing wrongdoers within the community, or in international terms through armies enforcing justice among nations. Paul even says that the use of the sword in enforcing justice is an execution of God's wrath upon the wrongdoers (vs. 4).

ANTICHRIST

Revelation 13 presents a different picture of the state, one where it is altogether demonically inspired. The interpretation of Revelation is notoriously difficult, and I can merely state my own conviction. While the prophecies of this book have to do with the Antichrist who will emerge at the end of time, the setting of the book is the situation in John's own day in the Roman Empire. Tendencies which will come to full disclosure in the Antichrist were already evident in the power of Caesar, and we see in Revelation 13 the picture of Rome as the historical type of the Antichrist of the end time.

The point to be made is that the state pictured in Revelation 13 has transgressed its divinely appointed bounds of preserving order and has become a totalitarian power, demanding not merely obedience and submission of its citizens, but their total allegiance, including their worship. Christians are no longer free to worship Christ; they must worship Antichrist. Here the state has usurped prerogatives which belong to God alone. Justice and good order have been swallowed up in a total demand. The legitimate boundary between human order and divine order has been obliterated. Human order has deified itself; its power has become completely demonic.

Biblical interpreters have often argued that Romans 13 and Revelation 13 embody two completely different views of the state. I think it is better to recognize, as we did even in Jesus' teachings, that the principle of human authority intrinsically embodies a tension between the divine and the demonic. As an instrument of order and justice, human authority expressed in government is divinely ordained. However, this very principle of authority is always subject to abuse and distortion; and when power becomes an end in itself and seeks its own glorification, transgressing the divinely appointed bounds of good order, it becomes demonic. No form of government, whether monarchical, oligarchical, or democratic, receives the approval of Scripture; all

can be an instrument of law and order and therefore a divinely ordained institution. Every form of government, including the democratic, bears the seed of demonic power and the potential of becoming totalitarian.

NONRESISTANCE

The Christian faces the problem that the basic ethical teachings of Jesus embody a clear element of nonresistance which seems to contradict the principle of force in human government. Jesus said, "Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matthew 5:39). Some thinkers have magnified these words of Jesus to the status of a total ethic, using them as a basis for international relationships and political action. Others have suggested that if America's national policy would literally follow this line of complete pacifism and nonresistance, if we should liquidate all of our armaments and military prowess and turn toward our enemies in a spirit of love and nonresistance, good would conquer evil and a reign of peace would be established in the world.

CONTRADICTION

How are we to harmonize Jesus' teachings about nonresistance with Paul's teaching of a political order resting upon physical force? Three alternatives are possible. The first would be to recognize a flat and irreconcilable contradiction between Jesus and Paul: Jesus taught nonresistance both as a personal and a political ethic, whereas Paul taught the principle of force to support law and order. Such a solution would be a desperate expedient; all the more so because in the verses which precede Paul's instructions about the state, he expresses a different ethic for personal conduct. In Romans 12:19ff, Paul teaches essentially what Jesus taught. Christians are never to avenge themselves. They are to return kindness and love for hostility; they are not to be overcome by evil but to overcome evil with good. Thus Paul makes it clear that a Christian's personal conduct embodies a different ethic than that for the ordering of the state. The Christian lives by the law of love, returning good for evil; the state has the responsibility of preserving law and order by the use of the sword as an instrument of the wrath of God upon evildoers.

ISOLATIONISM

Does this mean that the Christian must then pursue his life detached from his social order? A second solution to the problem would be to seek complete detachment from society. As a Christian living by the law of nonresistance in all relationships, both personal and social, it is impossible for me to bear arms as a soldier, to function as a police officer, to sit upon the bench as a judge, or even to participate in protecting my neighborhood and community from the violence of lawbreakers, thieves,

or looters. Furthermore, logic would seem to require that I must desist from paying taxes since a substantial portion of the taxes paid to the federal government is used to support our military machine.

A third alternative is suggested by Paul himself when he speaks of the Christian ethic in Romans 12 and the political ethic of Romans 13. This is the same principle embodied in our Lord's words when He speaks of two different realms of responsibility: Caesar's and God's. As a matter of fact, the Christian is a citizen of two worlds. In Philippians 3:20 Paul writes, "Our commonwealth is in heaven." This statement was particularly relevant for Philippi, which although a city in Greece, was a Roman colony which was proud that its citizens were first of all Romans. Philippi was a colony of Rome implanted in the midst of Greece. In a similar way, Christians are of the colony of heaven implanted in the midst of this world. Therefore we have a dual citizenship and responsibility. We are responsible to fulfill God's demands; we are also responsible to our society and culture.

That this responsibility extends to my conduct as a citizen is clearly illustrated by Paul's own conduct in Philippi. Paul was beaten and imprisoned for what was apparently interpreted as a breach of peace. When he was released after a night in prison, Paul demanded that his right as a Roman citizen be recognized. "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men who are Roman citizens, and have thrown us into prison; and do they now cast us out secretly? No! let them come themselves and take us out" (Acts 16:37). Paul was not expressing any spirit of vengeance and attempting to get even with those who had punished him; he was merely demanding that good law and order be fulfilled.

On another occasion, Paul claimed his Roman citizenship in a way that formally violated the principle of nonresistance. During his last visit in Jerusalem, when the tribune of the Roman guard was about to have Paul examined by scourging, Paul responded with the words, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man who is a Roman citizen, and uncondemned?" (Acts 22:25). Paul did not submit in passive nonresistance to this severe punishment but demanded that his rights as a Roman citizen be recognized.

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ETHICS

This suggests that there is no simplistic ethic which can be applied universally in all situations. The ethic by which I live in my personal reaction to people is not the same ethic that sustains the social order and governs my participation in it. In my individual contacts with other people, I must always react with love. When I experience violence in personal relationships, particularly when it is caused by my Christian witness, I will respond with literal nonresistance in love.

However, there will be many situations when I

must conduct myself as a member of an ordered society. Then I must conduct myself as a citizen in supporting law and order. In personal relationships, I do not even seek for just treatment but react to injustice with love. However, as a citizen, it is my duty to do all that I can to uphold justice in the social order. The theological reason for this is that God has ordained that justice be supported by the principle of force. Someone has said, "If justice is man's creation, then man may destroy what he has made." However, justice is a divinely ordained principle and the sword, wherever and however employed in support of justice, is in the will of God for all His creatures, whether they are pagans or Christians.

CONCLUSIONS

This leads to several concrete conclusions for the modern Christian in his relationship to the state. First, it is the will of God that I give my support to the state so far as it is an instrument of justice and the medium of law and order. The only alternative to this is anarchy. This means that on the local level I support the police, militia, judicial system; and on the international level, it means that I am obligated to support my country in war if such a war is necessary for the preservation of law and order and justice.

Second, I may not use force in any form as a way of righting personal wrongs. My reaction to those who harm me must be one of love. I must return good for evil, love for hatred.

Third, while the state is a divinely ordained institution and demands my obedience and submission, if at any point the demand of the state violates the will of God, I must obey God rather than man. This principle is enunciated when the Jewish state exceeded its proper authority by commanding Jesus' disciples not to preach and teach in the name of Jesus. Peter's answer was, "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). The state may never demand my total obedience. It may never infringe on my freedom to worship and serve God. Loyalty to the state is always conditioned by the higher loyalty to God.

A fourth principle is implicit. If the state has the divinely appointed authority to enforce law and order, it follows that the state has a right to claim my support even to the extent of war when such war is necessary in carrying out justice and enforcing international law and order.

It follows logically that if the state in its international policy exceeds the divinely appointed bounds of its authority, then it does not merit my support. If a state in its international policy becomes an instrument of injustice, if it pursues war for the sake of self-aggrandizement, if its demand for my support has the objective of self-glorification and the mere extension of its sphere of power, rather than self-preservation against aggressive, destructive forces, then I am not obligated to give my

support for such demonic ends.

One additional fact must be emphasized. If for conscience' sake I feel I must engage in civil disobedience, I should recognize that the state has a right to punish me. I may be subjected to serious fines and imprisonment for my disobedience, but such a price should willingly be paid, again for conscience' sake.

We must not forget that the Scriptures teach that the state has authority over its subjects and disobedience involves rightful punishment. Therefore, if my conscience makes me feel that I must disobey the laws of my state, including the laws requiring me to support it in military matters, I should be willing to accept the punishment that the state metes out for my disobedience.

30 A.D. VS. 1967 A.D.

One important factor which does not appear in the New Testament must be taken into consideration in this total problem. This is the difference between the political structure in a democratic state and a totalitarian state of New Testament times. The Roman emperors held their position by virtue of the support of the army. The governors sent out by Rome to rule the various provinces, such as Pontius Pilate, held absolute authority over their citizens within the laws of the Roman state. The citizens of Rome and of Roman colonies had no voice and shared no responsibility for the nature of their government or the selection of those who ruled over them. This is one of the reasons why Revelation 13 admonishes Christians to pursue no course of action but remain passive in a demonic state.

A democratic state places the matter of responsibility in a different light. Here the citizens of local communities and of the nation are the responsible parties for the selection of those who rule over them and therefore ultimately for the laws which the legislative bodies pass. Therefore, I as an individual citizen share a real measure of responsibility for the nature of my government and the laws under which justice is executed.

For this reason, the Christian citizen who accepts Romans 13 as a divine revelation for the character of the state must assume a particular sense of responsibility for the character of the state of which he is a citizen. Justice must be supported, injustice must be opposed; just rulers approved, and unjust rulers deposed. The idea that the Christian Church is to be concerned only about the preaching of the gospel and spiritual matters would appear at this point to be a clear violation of the principles embodied in the Word of God.

As a Christian accepting the Biblical revelation of the nature of the state, I am responsible to use my influence, my voice, and my vote to promote principles of right-doing and justice in the state of which I am a part.

This is a principle which demands more attention than evangelical Christians have given it.

Disillusioned Pacifist

by James S. Hewett

I am personally convinced that Jesus meant it when he said we are to love our enemies and do good to those that want to do us harm. I believe that Peter was right when he said, "If you do your duty and are punished for it and can still accept it patiently, you are doing something worthwhile in God's sight. Indeed, this is your calling. For Christ suffered for you and left you a personal example, and wants you to follow in His steps" (I Peter 2:20b, J. B. Phillips). I also think Peter hit the nail right on the head when he said, "Never pay back a bad turn with a bad turn or an insult with another insult, but on the contrary, pay back with good. For this is your calling—to do good and one day to inherit all the goodness of God" (I Peter 3:9, J. B. Phillips).

Now—if a person believes these things (and more, such as Matthew 5:38-48; Romans 12:16-21; Hebrews 13:12 and 13) he is immediately labeled a pacifist (although I prefer *Christian pacifist*), a follower of biblical non-resistance or some other such title.

And when I am pigeon-holed so neatly in this way, I find myself lumped with many other birds of an entirely different feather—and I for one want to jump up and down and scream out a resounding *no!* For if you are a believer in the biblical ethic of affirmational love—you are assumed to be a devout believer in, and supporter of what is currently known as (note the ostentatious capital letters) *The Peace Movement*. Be it here noted that though I am convinced of the biblical positions noted above—I have a most jaundiced eye when I look at *The Peace Movement* as such. Though my disenchantment is as multi-faceted as a costly diamond—let me narrow it down to four particulars.

I. Is it Christian?

The modern secular peace movement, as I have been exposed to it, is basically Gandhian rather than Christian, and this difference is more than academic. By and large the philosophy, methodology, aims, and aspirations of the movement are patterned after the struggle of Gandhi with the British. This difference alone is large enough to be explored in great depth, but let it suffice to say that Gandhi taught non-violent resistance and Christ taught non-resistance.

James Hewett, who received his B.D. from Fuller in 1957, is pastor of the Woodlake Avenue Friends Church in Canoga Park, Calif. A past president of the Alumni Association, he previously served for three years as minister of education at the Bethany Church of Sierra Madre. He received the B.A. degree from the University of Washington. This article is reprinted from a series in the Friends Collegiate Contact.

Ghandi resisted what he considered the evil of the British subjugation of his country using non-violence as a methodology. Christ taught us that the victim of an evil act should simply commit his cause in spiritual reverence to God, as Peter teaches in I Peter 2:23, and nakedly trusts God for justice and retribution.

Ghandi taught his followers to be non-cooperative as a form of massive resistance and thereby to get the government to capitulate. This is a form of coercive war. Christ taught us to be cooperative with the government as much as possible (Romans 12, 13), and to win it over with loving cooperation, not that of massive embarrassment, chaos, and intimidation.

It may well be that Gandhian approaches to conflict are far better than the napalm or thermo-nuclear—in fact I would agree that they are. But they are still negative, coercive, intimidative, and non-cooperative, and thereby not Christian.

When the Christian meets an evil world head on Paul suggests: "All this we want to meet with sincerity, with insight and patience; by sheer kindness and the Holy Spirit; with genuine love, speaking the plain truth, and living by the power of God. Our sole defense, our only weapon, is a life of integrity, whether we meet honor or dishonor, praise or blame (II Cor. 6:6-8, J. B. Phillips).

I submit to you that this is not the spirit of the Gandhian ethic of resistance through passive use of the inert body. Paul says that our only weapon is a life of integrity ("with the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left" RSV, II Cor. 6:7). The reason so many confuse the Gandhian and Christian positions is that both are opposed to the use of physical violence and many feel that this is enough common ground. But this is where the similarity ends. Gandhianism is a method of organized chaos and coercive resistance, literally a form of war—Christianity is a witness of non-resistance. The differences are real, genuine, in fact profound.

II. What is the difference in methodology?

A second area of difference between genuine Christian pacifism and the Gandhian Peace Movement is in the area

of basic methodology. Activists in both camps want to bring as large a measure of peace to our world as possible. The P.M. has cast its lot (for all intents and purposes) with endeavors to influence men in the mass—that is, by influencing legislation, by bringing pressure to bear on the government to encourage the government to change its policies from the top down, to change environments through finances, social programs, and so on.

And this is OK. However, this is not basically the strategy of the Christian Gospel—for though the P.M. approach is dramatic and may seem at times to be a necessity—it is essentially symptomatic rather than curative. It deals with the massive symptoms of a war-like spirit in the world—rather than with the heart cause of the matter in the hearts of individuals that make up the world.

Now symptoms are important—and it is often necessary to treat symptoms. When a child has an infection, the temperature soars and this is a symptom. When the temperature approaches a dangerous level, the doctor prescribes cool baths to keep the temperature from going too high and causing brain damage. And this, as parents, we do. But the cool baths to treat the fever are certainly not the total program. Something must be done to confront the infection at its core—and so the doctor prescribes some form of medication to deal with the more basic cause as well.

I personally applaud every bit of social legislation that helps alleviate suffering or makes conflict less likely or profitable. But the Christian Gospel teaches that the only really long-range, effective way to change large masses of people is to change them at heart—individually, one by one—to get down to the basic problem—the sinful heart of man.

James says in the fourth chapter of his letter, “What causes wars? And what causes fighting among you? Is it not your passions that are at war in your members? You desire and do not have; so you kill. And you covet and cannot obtain; so you fight and wage war.”

War and international conflict are manifestations of the warlike heart of man—so any solution that stops short of coming to grips with that reality is like giving a feverish malaria victim a cool bath—it fails to confront the real heart of the matter.

So, the Christian is given a task—to bring peace to the world that touches his world, and our methodology (prescribed and exemplified by Christ) is to reach it one individual at a time. We do this by introducing them to the peace of heart that Jesus Christ can bring. This, as George Fox put it, takes away the occasion of wars. When no man is your enemy, and the love of Christ constrains you—then there is no need to fight.

I have but one life to invest for Christ in this world. It is a world that is very hurt, chaotic, confused, and angry. It is a world full of ignorance, poverty, and sin. With such a precious few years of adult ministry available to me—frankly, I want to invest them at the level which I think will do the most good for time and eternity.

This is why the Friends Church emphasizes evangelism and world missions. The Christian disciples and missionaries around the world, and individual Spirit-filled Christians who witness for Christ in their daily lives are not only the greatest peace movement of our day—but the only peace movement that has so much as a prayer of a chance of doing

any real good. Until the world has found Christ—it will never find peace.

No, the methodology of the Gandian Peace Movement doesn't anger me because it is tinged with Red (though I believe it is)—but rather it seems about as likely an approach as trying to evaporate the oceans by submerging lighted matches in them. You see, there's basically only one objective to their methodology—it won't work. Christ's will!

III. *What should our relationship be?*

This is more an area of misunderstanding than of inherent and necessary difference. It has to do with the image of the Christian as a patriot. The Christian pacifist has both a positive and a negative witness—he is for peace and he is against war. And it is this negative aspect—of witnessing against war—that gets the Christian patriot in immediate trouble, public relations-wise. For the misunderstanding arises when the Christian, in speaking out in protest against war, does not indicate precisely *what* he is against in the midst of a warlike world and society. His failure to be precise can lead to unwarranted suspicion about his right to claim to be patriotic.

When I stand up to speak against war, and my country is involved in a war, immediately my loyalty and love of country is suspect in many people's eyes. For you see, this kind of Christian is often seen to be merely protesting against his country and its policies as such, when really as a Christian he is protesting against one specific policy (war) that is being used by all countries (including ours).

In an article, “Candles of Faith,” General Harold K. Johnson, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, wrote: “In the span of the last twenty years there have been more than 240 wars of one kind or another. Disregarding inconsequential conflicts, one can list over 100 significant instances of resort to violence in the political process. All but a very few of these occurred in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, Ninety percent were insurgencies, afflicting sixty-eight nations. Communists figure prominently in at least half.

When a person speaks out against war he needs to make clear that he is against all war on moral and spiritual grounds and not simply against one particular war. The Christian pacifist is against all war—either side—no matter who is doing the fighting. The implication is, however, that if you are a pacifist you are rooting for the enemy to win—which simply does not necessarily follow. Now much of this problem is unavoidable, because some super zealots won't have it any other way—they refuse to see this line of demarcation and there is not much you can do against that kind of mentality except love them in the Lord.

When I have talked with some secular pacifists and I pressed them, they were not really pacifists at all. And my moral and spiritual considerations were to them totally irrelevant. They were not really biblical or Christian pacifists at all—they were armchair foreign policy experts who were simply opposed to the U.S. position in a given conflict and thought they had found common cause with those whose banner was peace.

Sure, I'm upset about Vietnam. It is a singularly messy war. But I am not just against the one war that we happen

to be in this year—but the spiritual hostility of heart that causes 240 wars in two decades.

The witness for peace is an extension of our witness for Christ. It is basically a spiritual witness to the love of Christ that can pervade the heart and take away the occasion of war. And if the witness for peace is a spiritual witness, then it simply cannot be made in alliance with unregenerate man. The Church must witness clearly and loudly the whole counsel of God—but it can do this best when it is not caught in compromising and entangling alliances with a multitude of other voices.

What, then, should our relationship be to the secular peace movement? Simply the same relationship it has to the rest of our fallen and sinful society. We should speak prophetically *to* it rather than *with* it. Don't shun the unregenerate secular peace enthusiast; remember that in spite of his placard, his heart is at war with God and he is a sinner for whom Christ died, and you have a responsibility to share Christ's peace.

IV. *How do they appraise the nature of man?*

A fourth area of confusion that is involved when a Christian links his testimony to that of the secular peace movement is based on the fact of the difference there is in how these two ideologies appraise the basic nature of man and the consequent expectations they have for their peace witness. These two go together—how you estimate man, what you can, therefore, expect of him. The secular peace movement is not only Gandian in methodology, it is humanistic and Pelagian in its view of man. Consequently, such pacifists see their public protest against war and for peace as a strategem that either *will* work or *must* work. They believe in the inherent goodness of man. They believe that love conquers all—or at least they hope desperately that it will because if it doesn't we have had it. They trust that in the long run men are rational creatures and if you are loving and kind to them they will eventually respond to that and be loving and kind in return. In other words, the follower of this movement sees his program as the only bright hope for bringing peace to the world. He is idealistic, optimistic, and humanistic. And it all sounds most noble.

But the Bible teaches that men are fallen and sinful and warlike at heart and that in and of itself no such ethical appeal to man's better nature will work. As a Christian pacifist I am not so sanguine about either man's goodness or the effectiveness of the strategy of non-violence.

Don't get me wrong—I'm for peace. I'm against violence. I'm for giving a clear witness to the world in this matter. I'm for turning the other cheek—but not because it will work as a deucedly clever and strategic methodology, not because it will bring in a peaceful world in this generation or the next, but rather because it is right and moral and I am commanded to live that way by Christ, who alone makes it possible for a man to do it.

I am not only unimpressed with the possibilities of such a strategy to bring in world peace—I am convinced that practicing non-violence will probably *not* work in the sense in which they hope. Much pacifistic literature is redolant with stories about how through turning the other cheek armed men have dropped their guns and run, potential

rapists have fled and families were preserved alive in the midst of trouble. And there is certainly evidence that this has happened on occasions. But I do not believe for one minute that you can count on that happening more and more until all people just voluntarily see the reasonableness of peace and drop their knives, guns, and blackjacks.

No, when a Christian commits himself to life in a non-violent way in a warlike world he is just possibly going to get himself killed for his trouble. I do not know why I as a Christian should think otherwise—Christ got himself killed, and Peter (I Peter 2) tells us he was our example in this matter of absorbing evil.

If the message of the cross is anything, it is that men are sinful and they respond to loving kindness more often than not by killing the kind and righteous person. Otherwise, why do we read in Hebrews 11 of the lot of the faithful: “Others suffered mocking and scourging and were stoned, tempted, sawed in two, murdered with a sword. They went around in sheepskins and goatskins, needy, oppressed, mistreated. The world was not worthy of them as they wandered around in deserts and in the hills, in caves and holes in the ground.”

No, following Christ and his ethic of love is no guarantee at all of some neat strategem that will get you home free in this life—it is more likely to get you killed. These people of faith followed God's way, not because it was a clever way of getting elected *most popular*, or a way of bringing in days of peace for them and their children—they did it because it was the right thing to do, the moral thing to do, the thing that Christ commanded them to do—even though it did not seem to work in this life. They did it as a witness to another kingdom, the kingdom of love, in which it will work—the only kingdom in which it will work.

Neither my peace witness nor anyone else's will bring in world peace. As a matter of fact, the Bible teaches that the more men talk of peace, the more there will be war. And the culmination of all of man's efforts will be the greatest period of tribulation this world has ever known.

Don't get me wrong. I am not saying we should not work for peaceful relations among men and nations—we should! But what I am saying is that the Christian's reasons for doing so are moral and spiritual rather than expedient. They are long-term reasons rather than short-term tactics. The Bible teaches that we will not really get the peace the world seeks and that we witness to until Jesus Christ breaks through into history at his Second Coming and brings peace personally by a stroke of divine power. Meanwhile, as advance men of the kingdom, we live in the spirit and power of that kingdom of love. As such, we fit into this warlike world like a homerun in a football game. The ethic of non-violent and non-resistant love is right and moral and demanded of us by Christ—but it is not necessarily a clever and effective strategem that works miracles within our sinful society as we know it. It is not a technique—it is a witness to another world.

Yet, having said that, the Christian peace witness is the only way that any measure of peace will be brought to our world—for it is only as we bring men to personal peace with God that the day will arrive when Christ will return and establish his kingdom. So if strategy is important to you, share Jesus Christ with one person today.

Observations on Atlanta

by Paul King Jewett
Professor of Systematic Theology

On Monday, April 7th, at 5 a.m., I arrived in Atlanta, thinking to anticipate the crowds expected for the funeral of Martin Luther King. The airport was already bustling with activity, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference personnel were on the job to assist travelers. They arranged lodging for myself and my companion, a Fuller student from Watts, in a home that had been opened for the occasion. Our SCLC chauffeur drove us to Spelman College, where the body of the slain civil rights leader lay in state. Here was a sight for white upper-middle class indifferent eyes. I refer not to the silent form beneath the glass of the coffin, but to the line of poor black people coming to look their last upon one whose life had epitomized all their hopes. Dressed in their overalls and uniforms (it was between 6:30 and 7:30 in the morning), with a forlorn, sad resignation in their eyes, they filed past the bier—some holding up children for a glimpse. They had come before work to pay their respects to the man who had identified with them, eloquently spoken for them, and laid down his life seeking to help them.

After meeting our hosts, we went back into the city. On a narrow street flanked with broken sidewalks, neglected vacant lots and shabby stores and residences, we found the Ebenezer Baptist church of Atlanta, Georgia. Already crowds were milling about in anticipation of the removal of the body from the college chapel to the church. Upon entering the building, we found its modest contingent of pews—hardly sufficient for 300—rapidly filling. Flowers and a coffin in front indicated we were about to witness a funeral. Electing to stay, we learned that the deceased was the Dorcas of the church, a former Sunday school teacher of Martin Luther King. Though his father, with whom the civil rights leader shared the pastorate of the church, had nearly collapsed earlier, when viewing the body of his son, he came to preach this funeral sermon because he could not “let Ruth Davis down.” It was a moving service as he spoke, sometimes to the congregation, sometimes to the family, reminiscing of her life and devotion in Christian service.

As I looked about, I perceived that the interior appointments of the church were as modest as the influence of its pulpit has been magnificent. No air conditioning, no plush carpets, not even fresh paint. Could it be from this dingy pulpit a voice had been raised that had been heard throughout the land? What a contrast to the magnificent monuments of architecture in most of our cities, whose impact on the community is akin to a museum!

As soon as the funeral was over, the feverish activity of the technicians was renewed. TV cameras were rolled in; seeming miles of cord ran everywhere. Behind the church large trucks loaded with gear backed up to the doors; while in front men climbed the poles to tap the power that would beam the events of the next day to all Americans. (Even

Sunday school teacher, Governor Maddox, who opened his office on Tuesday for business as usual, was reputed to have watched events on television.)

Having visited the black-draped headquarters of SCLC, a short walk from the church, we drove over to the King's residence. Black slums were on every side, it seemed. Across the street from the home of the man who had championed the cause of the poor were homes with broken windows, littered yards and derelict autos.

The morning of the funeral dawned on crowds of unprecedented size. After a brief memorial service in the church, at which the mighty and the noble assembled, the four mile march began to Morehouse College, where public services were to be held. More significant than their astonishing numbers was the reserved demeanor of the multitudes gathered for the occasion. While a quarter of a million watched, as many more marched. I was swept along in an endless stream of black humanity that anticipated the mule-drawn casket. The woman next to me, in heels, inquired how far we should have to walk. Discovering that she had just come from Detroit and could find no locker at the airport, I carried her suitcase. We passed by the capitol building—heavily “guarded” by helmeted white troopers—singing “We Shall Overcome,” and “Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord.”

Arriving at the Morehouse campus, we broke ranks to make way for the cortege of official mourners. Hats were removed, and silence prevailed as Ralph Abernathy, following the bier, intoned the 90th Psalm. He was followed in turn by the widow and her children, the parents of the deceased, the official board of the SCLC and associates, trailing off indeterminately into an amorphous mass of humanity.

Many, unable to approach because of the multitude, anticipated the final act in the sad day's work and took up their place at the cemetery. Following the funeral, in this final committal to the dust, Martin Luther King made his grave with America's disinherited, being buried in a plot of ground which negroes of another generation had acquired when denied access to the white man's burial ground. Surrounded by industrial plants and abutting upon the state penitentiary is the potter's field where lies one of America's greatest sons. Forest Lawn has *David, The Crucifixion, The Fountain of Life, The Wee Chapel of the Heather*, diadoras, green grass, and rolling hills. A cemetery in Atlanta has a stone with this epitaph from an old spiritual sung by slaves:

*Free at last, free at last;
Thank God Almighty,
I'm free at last.*

The Old Testament and Worship Today

by
David Allan Hubbard
President, Fuller Theological Seminary

Worship today is almost a dirty work. Probably dirty is too strong: it might be best to say dusty. It is mislaid, unused, forgotten. It lies in a chest in the closet of our vocabulary and collects dust.

Other words come to the fore in a hurry when we riffle through our minds to find a way to pinpoint the uniqueness, the basic mission, the chief goal of man. We think of words like *master* and *control*, because ours is an era of power. We think of words like *love* and *enjoy*, because ours is an era that thinks of relationships and pleasure.

We think of words like *solve* because we are technologically orientated, or *serve* because we have humanitarian concern. We think about *success* because we are in a materialistic kind of society. And for some, just to *survive* is enough, because we feel we are in a hostile situation.

How different the people in the Old Testament viewed this central issue of life. For those true Israelites who understood their faith, to worship—to praise God—was to live. Praise was their reason for being, the life-breath which sustained their very existence.

Now if worship stood at the center of Israel's life, as the Psalms, for instance, show us, why has it slipped to the circumference, or even out of the circle of our lives? If it graced their dining tables, workbenches and schoolrooms, why does it get tucked in our storage bins and bottom drawers? For some I suppose the reason is *rebellion*. “I've had it,” is their motto. They're burned and embittered by false starts, hollow forms, shattered fantasies. Rebels. Disillusioned. *Idolatry* may be the reason for others. If the rebel says, “I've had it,” the idolater says, “I've found it.” False worship has blandly taken the place of true worship. We take our relative causes, our limited ideals, and deify them. Our lives have found their rallying points without God. Idolatry.

For others, the problem may be apathy or insolence. If the rebel cries, “I've had it,” the idolator boasts, “I've found it,” the apathetic or the insolent person jeers, “Who needs it?”

For some, science has replaced God as the explanation of reality. Technology has nosed its way into the tent of religious experience and nudged God to the outside. Man, who has coped with many of his problems, has the feeling that he can cope with them all, and worship becomes irrelevant. How are we going to bridge the gap between the style of life that the Israelites knew and what you and I are tempted to adopt as our attitudes today? It's hard to think of a greater contrast. In fact, we may wonder if we can get there from here. But if we are going to try, we have to look at

what worship meant to the Israelites and see if we can enter into that meaning.

To the true sons of Israel, *worship begins with memory*. Now memory to the Israelite is not just vague recollection of the past. It is the ability to project themselves into bygone events. Or to put it another way, it is their ability to draw the past into the present. Sometimes we use the word *rehearsal* for this memory; it means to go over it again and again and again in such a way that it becomes part of us.

Wherever we turn in the Old Testament we find the rehearsal of the great deeds of God. The Israelites remind us that they were a small and struggling people—“one man's family” you might call them—as they went into Egypt. God brought them out a mighty nation, defeated their enemies, led them through the sea, brought them to Sinai, revealed his will in the law, put their enemies to flight in the wilderness, cut the Jordan in two, settled them in the land of Canaan. All this they remembered, and they lived in the light of the high deeds of God.

Worship was not just a matter of mystical experience with some being who might be “out there.” Worship centered in the recollection of what God had done on behalf of his people, and what he was still capable of doing. Now this kind of rehearsal or recital led to *repentance*. When confronted with the mighty deeds of God, with his lofty sovereignty, with his condescending grace, the Israelites had no choice but to see the contrast between him and themselves. Their experience was like Isaiah's in the temple. When he saw the Lord high and lifted up, and found himself in the presence of the King of all the world, the sovereign of nature and history, he fell on his face, laid low by his sense of unworthiness and uncleanness.

No worship can take God's grace for granted. No worship can celebrate human worthiness. No worship can express thanks to God as we express thanks to equals. “A nice favor you've done for me—that's good. I'll do something for you some day.” That's not what the Bible means by worship. It means *the memory of what God has done* and what he has shown himself to be.

From this rehearsal and this repentance there comes a *sense of security*. You have to read ancient eastern myths in order to understand what Israel's faith in the one true God meant to the people. Put yourself in the place of the Babylonians, for instance. Each man or woman had a personal god who was in touch with gods a little higher up the scale, who in turn was in touch with a crew of specialists who could be called upon in the times of emergencies. If the Babylonian could work his way up through this organiza-

tional chart, up through the echelons of divine hierarchy, he could finally get to the top of the pantheon. But he had to use the yellow pages to figure out which god was the specialist who could handle his situation.

Into this scene of chaos and confusion comes the one true God, who reveals himself as Lord of all of life and brings to it unity and security. And faith in God drives away fears of magical spells and casts out fright of dark taboos. The gloomy spirits that haunt the night in pagan places are dispelled, and the Psalmist says, "I can walk through the valley of the deepest kind of shadow and fear no misfortune, because God is with me." Worship for the Israelites began with memory.

To the true sons of Israel *worship continues with expectation*. The God who has worked in the past is Lord of the future. In Psalms like 74 and 80, the story of a past deliverance is recited; its significance is appropriated in the present; and its implications are praised for the future. The Psalmist realizes that the God who has power to save him out of one difficult situation—illness, false accusations, crooked witnesses working out a rigged trial to put him on the spot, enemies conniving to take his property away, drought, famine, invasion—has within him the power of all salvation. In the specific act of rescue, the Psalmist sees the promise of the salvation of the whole world.

A Psalmist (e.g. 22) will say, "Lord, get me out of this tight spot, and when you do, the ends of the earth will rejoice; all posterity will celebrate it; generations yet unborn will sing your praise." We tap him on the shoulder while he is praying and say, "Now wait a minute; nobody even knows about your predicament. What makes it so cosmic in your mind? Why does it have this continuity through the generations?" And he would say to us, "Because of the kind of God that I have. In one act of salvation, in one great loving experience of rescue from dire difficulty, there lies the whole potential, the vast possibility of the salvation of the world."

The worship that began with memory continues with expectation that the mighty purposes of God in creation will be carried out. God, who has chosen Israel and led Israel through so many devious and crooked ways, will see to it that every seed of his creative and redemptive purpose will be brought to bloom. This is the kind of God the Israelites worshipped.

To the true sons of Israel, *worship culminates in response*—a response of fellowship and obedience. There can be no fellowship without worship. There is no patting God on the back. There is no *buddy-buddy* intimacy with God in either Testament. We have it in some of our sentimental gospel songs, but it is hard to find apostolic sanction for that kind of saccharine sentimentality. This is not a romantic relationship. Discipleship and romance are not the same thing. Worship concludes with response, a response which leads to fellowship, a fellowship which stems from adoration. Fellowship comes on God's terms—repentance and forgiveness.

Fellowship leads to obedience. We chafe at the thought of law. Rules and regulations make us edgy, queasy, chary. The Psalmist, on the other hand, delighted in the Law. He meditated in it by day and by night. He said it gives stability so that we are planted like a tree by rivers of running water, growing verdant leaves and luxurious fruit.

The Psalmists had the advantage of seeing the contrast between their lives and their neighbors. They saw the chaos of other people. They saw the lawless disintegration that took place among the Canaanites and they realized that the law was God's way of setting them free to be his best. It was God's way of marking off those areas of life into which man can go only to his own hurt. And they reveled in the law because it brought unity, discipline, and freedom to their living.

But they not only delighted in the law as part of their obedience, they also shared God's grace.

Israel's worship took place in a covenant context. God had entered into an agreement with Israel. He had said, "I have done great things for you when I brought you out of slavery and set you free. Now, this is to be your response to me. You're to share with others the grace I've shared with you."

The law of neighbor love—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"—is not just an offhand bit of advice that God gave to make social relationships a little smoother. Of course we can live more comfortably in a neighborhood when we are all trying to love our neighbors rather than stealing their lawnmowers and throwing garbage in their gardens. But God gave the law of neighbor love because the Israelites had known what it was to be oppressed, not treated as neighbors but as slaves. God said, "Your neighbor is just like you. He wants the same freedom, the same mercy, the same grace that I have lavished on you."

Worship always has a "Go thou and do likewise" component in it. It is not going too far to say we become like the one we worship. If we do not, we can raise the question, "Do we really worship?"

It is a despicable thing to worship a God of redeeming grace who loves all people, while we harbor hatred and prejudice in our hearts. What a pity it is that it takes a President's Commission on Riots to point out racism in American life when we as Christians should have been repenting of this all along. God who loves us as we are, who has entered into our poverty, who commands the gospel to be preached to the poor, who has stooped to our weakness, mighty as he is—this God sends us forth to respond in obedience to him as part of our worship. Worship concludes with response. No other worship is worthy of the name.

At the beginning we contrasted the worship-centered way of the Israelites with our tendency to crowd worship to the margin. It is easy for us to say, "We know more about life than they did. They were naive and simple in their dependence upon God." But actually all the arguments of Scripture run the other way. If at their stage of history they could worship whole-heartedly with only the Old Covenant given to them, what about us?

And we have to raise the question at each point, if they . . . what about us? If their worship began with memory, what about ours? How much more we have to remember. We see not only an Exodus and the establishment of a Kingdom; we see Jesus Christ—God in the flesh, God spelled out in human terms. We see One spending himself on a cross for us and for our salvation. We see a sealed tomb opened. We see a straggling group of confused believers fused into a mighty church and taking the gospel round the world. If they worshipped by remembering, what about us?

As their worship continued with expectation, so does ours. If they had hope, as far away from the fulfillment of God's promises as they were, what about us? If they could look down the centuries and realize the mighty God who had saved them in the past was again to bear his saving arm in the future, how much more can we hope? We have seen Jesus Christ in whom all of their hopes found their yea and their amen. We have seen Jesus Christ in whom all of God's purposes are woven together. We have seen him ascended high above all principalities and powers, putting all enemies under his feet, reigning until he has put even the last enemy under his feet—Death. We can lift up our heads and rejoice because our redemption draws nigh. And we can worship with an eye on the future.

If their worship concluded with response in obedience to the rigorous demands of the law, how much more can our worship spark response? The free grace of Jesus' gospel has come to us; before our eyes loving obedience has been spelled out to perfection in Jesus Christ. The power of the Holy Spirit is at work in our lives, teaching us to love and to obey, showing us the norms and standards by which to govern ourselves in a confused generation. If they, . . . what about us?

Faith, hope, and love are the terms the Apostle Paul used to describe our worship. Faith is our banking on who God is in the light of what he has done. Faith corresponds to the *memory* of worship. Hope is our confidence that the future is cared for because of what God has done in the past. Hope expresses the *expectation* of worship. Love is our treating of others in the way God has treated us. Love is the *response* of worship.

At the communion table these three combine: In memory of Christ we eat and drink, showing forth his death in our loving witness until he comes to consummate our hope.

I suppose when it comes right down to it, there are only *two styles of life*: grace—accepting who God is and what he has done and humbling ourselves before him; or insolence—doing things our own way. Only *two views of history* in the long run; God's sovereignty, working out his purposes in spite of sin; or confusion which ends in frustration. Only *two attitudes toward reality*: worship in spirit and in truth; or idolatry.

It's the mark of man's finitude that he will worship. He knows his limitations. He hangs his hopes and his heart on something in life, because he knows that he can't go it alone. It's the seal of man's dignity that he must worship God alone because nothing else in the universe save God is worthy of that worship. Man out-ranks everything else. And to worship anything else but God is not to lift himself in exaltation, but to debase himself in ignominy.

Worship puts us in our place—servants of God—utterly obliged to him. Worship lifts us to our place—sons of God, heirs of grace, loved and cherished by him, called by him to carry out his work in the world. Apathy, rebellion, idolatry are not even in it when it comes to this kind of life. Only worship can set us free. Only worship will release God's power. Only worship will take the full measure of our human potential. For his glory and for our good the Father seeks those who worship him. May you and I, in a new way, be found in that company.

Thou Shalt Not Something or Other

by Art Hoppe

(Reprinted with permission from the San Francisco Chronicle)

Scene: *The summit of Mt. Sinai*

Time: *The present. Moses holding two stone tablets in his hand, enters nervously.*

Moses: Sorry to bother you again, Sir. But I'm afraid we need another revision in the original copy.

The Lord (with a sigh): Another? What now?

Moses: Well, Sir, it's where you say here, "Thou shalt not kill."

The Lord: That seems perfectly clear and concise.

Moses: But it's causing an awful hagggle among Your Theologians, Sir. The Catholics feel it applies to spermatazoa and ova; the Conservatives only after the union of the two; the Moderates would reserve it for 20-week old embryos and up—and the Liberals feel it takes effect precisely at the moment of birth.

The Lord (puzzled): But why would anyone want to kill an unborn child?

Moses: Primarily, Sir, on the chance it might emerge deformed.

The Lord: In that case, why don't they wait to see whether it does before they kill it?

Moses: Oh, all theologians oppose killing children after they're born. Except, of course, at a distance of more than 500 yards.

The Lord: Why 500 yards?

Moses: In wartime, Sir, it is a terrible thing to kill a child with a rifle bullet and an atrocity to do so with a bayonet. But all recognized theologians agree that it is permissible, if regrettable, to blow them up with high explosives or incinerate them with jellied gasoline, as long as it is dropped from an airplane or fired from an artillery piece—particularly, the Christians feel, if you do so to save them from Godless Communism.

The Lord: I suppose it does do that.

Moses: Of course, once a male child reaches the age of 18 he may be killed in virtually any fashion on the battlefield except with poison gas. The use of poison gas in war, all the theologians agree, is the greatest atrocity.

The Lord: Then where do they use it?

Moses: Only in the State-operated gas chambers. It is used there, with the approval of the theologians, because it is the most humane way to kill people.

The Lord: But if it's the most humane. . . . Never mind. Is that all?

Moses: I almost overlooked germ warfare. It is also unconscionable to save people from Godless Communism by inflicting them with any fatal sickness—except radiation sickness which causes a lingering and painful death.

The Lord (shaking his head): Moses, I don't know what to do.

Moses (briskly): Well, first off, Sir, I'd suggest setting aside a five-mile stretch of the Pasadena Freeway.

The Lord: Whatever for?

Moses: You certainly aren't going to get all that on two stone tablets, Sir. Now, I've got a rough draft here of an effective compromise that should mollify all factions. It begins: "Thou shalt not kill any person between the ages of minus four months (see Appendix) and 18 years (asterisk) at a distance of less than 500 yards (see Footnote 7a, Chapter Three), with any of the following: . . ."

The Lord (in measured tones): Never mind, Moses, I have a better idea. Gabriel! Gabriel, come here. And bring your trumpet.

Book Reviews

The Vietnam War: Christian Perspectives, edited by Michael P. Hamilton (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.), is reviewed by Richard H. Johnson, chaplain (CPT), USA.

Editor Hamilton admits the greatest failure of the book in the preface when he says, "We were not able, however, to gain access to addresses in support of the administration given by theologians of stature comparable to Dr. Blake and Dr. King and dealing with the war in a comprehensive and direct manner." One would also hope that an editor would attempt to validate statistics when putting messages in print. I sincerely doubt if some statistics given by Dr. King can be validated.

It would seem that most theologians represented in the book have made a political decision about the Vietnam conflict and that they are out to bolster their own position. One very notable exception is Dr. R. Paul Ramsey, who takes the most objective position about the Vietnam conflict that I have read.

Every Christian should have his thinking challenged by the articles of this book. No matter what his conclusion about the Vietnam conflict, there is at least hope for him if he cares enough about the will of God to examine the situation. Pity him who doesn't care enough to investigate.

I hope that someone will write a sequel to this book with an examination of the historical theology of force and some new biblical insights into a present day theology of force. Is force ever right? How far can force go? These are basic questions that theologians need to answer today so that the rightness of actions from law enforcement to war can be judged.

This review is the personal view of the author and in no way is the official view of the army.

God and Evil, by William Fitch (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967, 183 pages, \$2.65, paperback), is reviewed by Donald M. Bowman, B.D. '56, pastor of the Community Bible Church (Evangelical Free), Folsom, California.

With a subtitle, *Studies in the Mystery of Suffering and Pain*, Fitch's work begins auspiciously with the Prelude promising to grapple with this large subject that has plagued mankind since the beginning of human history. The book is a series of sermons or studies on the general theme *God and Evil*. While the book is biblical, it lacks imagination and leaves the subject still a mystery. Perhaps I felt the book was trite as the following paragraph on page 128—"Who shall stand in that day of wrath? They only who are hidden in the Rock of Ages. They shall not be afraid when fear cometh."

With some negative feelings when reading I felt there was an Anti-Vietnam War bias on page 90 when he spoke of Vietnam's people who "became the helpless, hapless victims of jet bombers and flame throwing tanks." Perhaps the author feels that only the United States may be blamed for the horrors of that war.

There were some redeeming elements in the book as the chapter on *The Cross—God's Answer to Evil*. I found myself generally in agreement with Fitch's biblical arguments and feel the book has value for those who want to be introduced to this difficult subject.

Count It All Joy, by William Stringfellow (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967, \$3.00), is reviewed by Wilson G. Parks, M.R.E. '66, chaplain (CPT), USA, Kitzingen, Germany.

The 101 pages of this little book include the entire text of the Epistle of James upon which the book is supposed to shed the light of understanding. Actually, *Count It All Joy* is a collection of reflections expressed originally in lectures on the Letter of James given to the 1962 Ecumenical Study Conference of the United Christian Youth Movement. William Stringfellow herein presents a series of incisive meditations on the major themes: faith, doubt, and temptation, from the Epistle, with special attention being given to the juxtaposition of faith and works in the Christian life.

What is offered here is certainly contemporary. Stringfellow does not claim to be a biblical scholar. But he does know a great deal about life and he is quite confident that the message "contained in" the Bible is relevant and powerful and that Jesus Christ speaks to the contemporary scene.

Stringfellow is candid and his observations with specific illustrative material on churchianity lend authority to what he says. But lucid statements of problems are not always followed by sound biblical and understandable solutions, e.g., the necessity of Jewish involvement in the ecumenical mission because the Church is the new Israel.

Especially powerful are the author's thoughts on the independence of the Word of God in lives and on the matter of doubt experienced in the context of faith. Several pages are given to the author's report of what happened to a group of teenagers (as well as himself) when he was invited to teach their "class" in a certain parish in New York City. The Bible was approached objectively. "... the "class" labored on in its attempt to listen to the Word in Romans. We did not get very far into the Letter when the last session came; we were still in the midst of the fourth chapter, still reading the Letter sentence by sentence, sometimes literally, word by word, still persevering in asking, 'what is being said?' Yet there was extraordinary excitement in the enterprise and something of the integrity and substance of the Word was communicated to each of us."

Class Notes

1950

William Mull (x'50) accepted the pastorate of the Emmanuel Bible Fellowship in Sunbury, Pennsylvania, in February. He received his Th.M. from Princeton in June, 1966, assisted by his wife and nine children (including three sets of twins).

1951

Charles Corwin of the Tokyo Evangelistic Center has just dedicated a dorm to be used for Christian students at Waseda University in Japan. He has also just published a dictionary of Japanese-English idioms, a new concept in dictionaries.

LaMar Price (x'51), assistant professor of elementary education at California State College, Los Angeles, has received the doctor of education degree from USC.

1952

Marvin Mayers, assistant professor of anthropology at Wheaton College, was cited for excellence in teaching and named teacher of the year.

1956

David Plank has been assigned to the Naval Academy as chaplain, beginning next August.

1957

Jon Braun (x'57) had an article in the spring issue of *Collegiate Challenge* entitled "How to get 'Fallen' into Love."

1961

John E. Miller of the Central American Mission is able, by courtesy of the Far Eastern Broadcasting Company, to broadcast by short wave radio into Baborigame. John has just spent a week with a visiting dentist learning the skills of pulling teeth.

William W. Buehler has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of New Testament at Barrington College.

Wayne A. Fisher (x'61) has assumed duties as pastor of the United Presbyterian Church in Clarion, Iowa.

1962

William H. Craig is the new pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Sherman Oaks, California.

Donald Liebert and wife announce the birth of Lynn Karen on February 23 in Collingswood, New Jersey.

1963

Dwight W. Whipple and wife announce the birth of Timothy Dwight on March 23 in Bellingham, Washington.

1964

Philip F. Cousar (x'64) has returned to Glendale from Nebraska to assume duties as controller of Gospel Light Publications.

1965

Samuel A. Mateer was installed as the pastor of the Altadena Valley Presbyterian Church in Birmingham, Alabama, in January. He had previously served as assistant pastor of the Sixth Avenue Presbyterian Church in Birmingham for two years.

George Carpenter (x'65) became Christian education director of the First Presbyterian Church in Fillmore in February. George had been with the Board of National Missions of the UPUSA working with Indians in Arizona.

1966

Harvey Buer visited campus this month and reported that they have launched a building program for an education unit at the Hillsdale Community Church in Portland, Oregon.

1967

Arlene Lui (x'67) married Wayne McKellar of Los Angeles.

Gene Whitney (x'67) is serving as part-time boy's camp chaplain of the Christian Jail Workers, Inc., in addition to completing studies at Cal Baptist Seminary.

Don Wright has been serving as pastor of the Bethel Baptist Church of Ord, Nebraska, since November.

Al Gephart was married to Ellen Flood on April 6.

Books for Review

Books listed here are sent to alumni in the order requests are received.

Come, Immanuel (Preaching from Advent to Epiphany), by Richard R. Caemmerer, Sr., Concordia Publishing Company (Paperback).

Covenant and Community (The life and writings of Pilgram Marpeck), by William Klassen, Eerdmans.

Introducing Contemporary Catholicism, by Leonard Swidler, Westminster Press (Paperback).

Trilogy: **Learning to Love God, Learning to Love Ourselves, Learning to Love People**, by Richard Peace, Zondervan Publishing House (Paperback).

Living Without God—Before God, by David O. Woodyard, Westminster Press (Paperback).

Prayer in the Secular City, by Douglas Rhymes, Westminster Press (Paperback).

From Call to Service (The making of a minister), by Glenn E. Whitlock, Westminster Press (Paperback).

Spirit of the Living God (The biblical concepts interpreted in context), by Dale Moody, Westminster Press.

Sunday (The history of the day of rest and worship in the earliest centuries of the Christian Church), by Willy Rordorf, Westminster Press.

The Shape of the Theological Task, by Robert T. Voelkel, Westminster Press.

The Ambiguity of Religion (A positive response to the negative elements in secularized Christianity), by David Baily Harned, Westminster Press (Paperback).

God Up There? (A study in divine transcendence), by David Cairns, Westminster Press.

The New Testament (An introduction for the general reader), by Oscar Cullmann, Westminster Press (Paperback).

War and Conscience in America, by Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., Westminster Press (Paperback).

With Bands of Love (Lessons from the Book of Hosea), by David Allan Hubbard, Eerdmans Publishing Company (Paperback).

Placement Opportunities

Principal

Baptist elementary school, Whittier, California. 250 enrollment. Principal is part of Bethany Baptist Church staff.

Youth Minister and Christian Education Director

Calvary Presbyterian Church, Fresno, California. Strong educational program; excellent facilities. Two colleges in city.

Pastor

Community Bible Church, Central Point, Oregon. Independent; evangelical; membership 100; attendance 200. New church and educational building. Suburban Medford.

Pastor

Community Interdenominational Church, Chandler, Arizona. New church, open to charismatic movement. Sun. attendance 165. Reformed. Pastor is only staff.

Pastor

Evangelical Covenant Church, Hastings, Nebraska. Regular pastoral duties—no additional staff. Prefer Covenant or Free Church background. City church in an agricultural and manufacturing community.

Pastor

First Baptist Church, Homer, New York. A.B.C. Complete pastoral responsibilities. Rural area in southern tier. Membership 375.

Assistant Pastor

First Baptist Church, Rosemead, California. A.B.C.

Pastor

First Presbyterian Church, Philip and Milesville, South Dakota, Conservative. Serve two churches in small communities 30 miles apart.

Assistant Pastor

First Presbyterian Church, Roseburg, Oregon. Primary responsibility to develop program of outreach and visitation. Be related to educational program of church and youth groups. Conservative. Membership 817; attendance 300.

Assistant Pastor

First Presbyterian Church, Sherman Oaks, California. UPUSA. Share total ministry. Emphasis on youth, especially senior high. Experience required. Sunday attendance 350. Largely professional.

Associate Pastor

First Presbyterian Church, Yorktown Heights, N.Y. UPUSA. Share the total ministry in growing congregation. Interest in youth and CE. Sunday attendance 450. Suburban New York City area.

Director of Christian Education

Pleasant Valley Baptist Church, Camarillo, California. ABC. Work with S.S., B.Y.F., music committee. New building program started.

Youth Minister

Rose Drive Friends Church, Yorba Linda, California. Sunday morning attendance 200. Active youth department.

Pastor

Second Presbyterian Church, Duluth, Minnesota. UPUSA. General pastoral duties. Have assistant in youth and community work. Inner city area.

Assistant Pastor

Westminster United Presbyterian Church, San Jose, California. UPUSA. Team ministry with pastor; prime responsibility with college age, high school and jr. high. Membership 770; Sunday attendance 550.

Youth Center Director

Atlantic City Rescue Mission, Atlantic City, New Jersey. Complete responsibility for setting up and supervising entire youth program. Inner city.

THEOLOGY NEWS AND NOTES
MAY 1968