

12-1-1966

The Opinion - Vol. 06, No. 03

Fuller Theological Seminary

Richard A, Bower

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion>

Recommended Citation

Fuller Theological Seminary and Bower, Richard A,, "The Opinion - Vol. 06, No. 03" (1966). *The Opinion*. 46.
<https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion/46>

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 The Opinion by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact archives@fuller.edu.

the opinion



 Vol. VI, No. 3

 December, 1966

In the interest of providing some background material on the Delano Grape Strike and the Church's involvement therein, we offer the following article in two parts, hoping that thereby some of the questions which have been raised will be satisfactorily answered.

THE CHURCH AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE-A PARTIAL REPORT

by Rev. Wayne C. Hartmire, Jr.

Introduction

This paper is written for churchmen who need a summary of the facts and issues surrounding the grape strike. It is written from the perspective of those churchmen who have sought to assist the workers in their struggle to be strong and to bargain with their employers. Several things are assumed:

- 1) There is real human suffering among farm workers that results from superior attitudes (even contempt) on the part of many established citizens and from basic injustice for which we are all responsible.
- 2) Mainline Protestant churches in general have failed to include farm workers in their life and work. They are thus isolated from farm worker suffering and have tended in the natural course of institutional life to affirm the unjust status quo.
- 3) Growers and workers like other men have a capacity for both good and evil. Too much power by one group coupled with basic economic self-interest will result in injustice, i.e., the powerful group will take advantage of the less powerful. At present growers have enormous power compared to their workers. Justice demands a countervailing power that will come as workers are organized and have the right to bargain on issues that directly affect their lives. For decades our denominations have supported the right of workers to so organize. Both the Northern and Southern California Councils of Churches have called for the extension of collective bargaining rights under the National Labor Relations Act to agricultural workers.

Beginning of the Strike

Filipino workers who have lived and worked in the Delano area for years were dissatisfied with wages in the 1965 Delano area grape harvest. While working in the Coachella Valley they received \$1.40 per hour plus an incentive piece rate. Upon returning to Delano for the harvest there they discovered that wages were \$1.25 per hour plus a smaller incentive. With the help of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC), they organized for bargaining. Letters were sent to the employers

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

REV. WAYNE C. HARTMIRE, JR. is a Presbyterian minister, presently serving as Director of the California Migrant Ministry, an Agency of the Southern California Council of Churches.

EDITORIALS

A CHRISTMAS MEDITATION

Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given. . .Isaiah 9:6

The joy that Christmas brings is often mixed with perplexing doubt. It must have been somewhat that way on the first Christmas. There in a small Judean town was born the Messiah, the King who would deliver, the Son of God. For those who understood, this must have brought joy unspeakable. But at the same time there must have been some lingering doubt, some fear that all of this was wishful thinking. Everything seemed to be all wrong. The rude straw bed, the humble country-folk parents, the simple shepherd guests: all seemed so wrong. Everything appeared so hopeless for this babe who was to be the Savior of all mankind.

So, also, it is for us today. The message of Christmas brings us a hope we desperately need. But it is a hope we often grasp with lingering doubt. Our lives continually reveal a tension between faith and doubt. Our faith is in God who came to us in Christ. But our doubt exists because of the unsuspected way God shows His love to us.

The first Christmas came amidst the darkest night. There was the long night of more than 500 years of Jewish suffering. There was the still night of the lonely shepherds. And there was the cold, bleak night of a man and his wife-with-child. In the midst of night came the helpless, crying baby upon whom "the hopes and fears of all the years" rested.

But all was not darkness. That which made this night different from all other nights was the presence of an incomparable light. There was the light of the Star, the light which guided men to the birth place of the King. There was the light of the angels--the glory of the Lord--which shone brightly 'round the shepherds, lighting their sorrowful hearts with hope. The light which eclipsed all other lights, however, was that of the child. He was the light which came into the world, the true light whom the darkness has not overcome.

The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light;
those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness,
on them has light shined. (Is. 9:2)

What meaning can we find in this darkest night or in this tiny crying baby? Or, as Pierre Maury has put it, "What does he / the baby / say--what can he say--to our lives weighed down by their woeful past and their uncertain future? Has he a real meaning for us, something more than a mere fleeting emotion?"

In the child, Emanuel, is found the light which lightens our darkest night. It is the light of God's redemptive love. It is the light which dispells the dark shadow of death and brings us tidings of great joy: the tidings that God so loved the world that he sent his only Son.

But Christmas will mean nothing to us this year if we merely smile at the young babe in the manger, if we merely say "At last! The King has come!" The brightness of the light witnesses not only to the fact "he has come" but also to the fact that "he is King." We cannot look on the rude manger scene and then go on our way as before. Having seen the humiliation of God in the lowly manger, we cannot but give of ourselves to Him, the King, who gave all for us. This is the mystery of the light: that in the most unlikely place, in the most unlikely manner God came to us men and

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

EDITORIALS

A CHRISTMAS MEDITATION (continued)

made our night our brightest day.

Therefore, may our prayer this Christmas season be the prayer of the 17th century German poet, Paul Gerhardt:

Beside Thy manger here I stand,
O Thou who ever livest,
And bring Thee with a willing hand
The very gifts Thou givest.
Accept me: 'tis my mind and heart,
My soul, my strength, my every part,
That Thou from me requirest.

In deepest night of woe I lay
Till Thou didst shine upon me.
My night's become my brightest day,
And joy and light surround me!
O Light of heaven, come down to earth,
Of faith and hope renewing birth,
How lovely is Thy beauty!

////

RAB

*

*

*

HUNGRY SWINE

Once again the saints at Fuller have shown their distaste for corporate worship. The worship chapel on Friday, November 18 was attended by only a fraction of the student body. If the chapel committee had offered the student body an attractive package of information or even the opportunity to see and hear a significant minister, the attendance would have easily doubled that of the worship chapel. But, numbers are not to the point.

To this writer, our lack of interest in corporate worship reflects precisely our spiritual individualism at Fuller. Many of us are here partly because we were unable to submit to the corporate discipline of any denomination. Having grown up spiritually in independent Christian organizations, we feel uncomfortable among the masses of Christians who collectively bear the titles of Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, etc. For us, the answer to this discomfort is a sojourn at Fuller where no ecclesiastical machinery can exercise its discipline on tender theologues. Granted that the time spent here fulfils God's desire for each of us, let us consider an obvious pitfall which needs to be avoided.

The discomfort with denominations breeds a spiritualism which does not trust any large group. Whenever the group requires conformity of expression from its members, the spiritualist avoids membership. Being evangelicals, we retreat behind our biblical heritage and conform only to the authority of the Word of God. The sword of the Lord becomes merely a shield to protect us not only from the enemy but also from the discipline of corporate effort.

It is only as we examine the written Word itself that we benefit from being together. In the acquisition of information, other minds are most convenient. Here, at least, the vitality of our discussion depends upon our individual dissatisfaction with what others say. But, this questioning spirit cannot be allowed to dominate our

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

EDITORIALS

HUNGRY SWINE (continued)

basis for fellowship. The combination of a restless quest for doctrinal truth and the discomfort with established Christian communions previously referred to can be deadly to the corporate nature of the church. Our individual election and the integrity of our doctrine are forces which must be balanced by the unquestioned knowledge that we are members of one body. Otherwise, our seminary family takes on the character of hungry swine, squealing after the bread of life, and the great experiment of a single school for Christians of varying persuasion of faith and practise fails to be anything more than a convenient trough of evangelical information. The last opportunity for corporate worship established the fact chapel is attractive primarily for thrills and information.

This editor writes in a spirit of confession as well as exhortation. Therefore, he requests replies in the same spirit, and reminds his readers of the distinction between confessions and excuses. ////

DKG

*

*

*

THE CHURCH AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE-A PARTIAL REPORT (continued)

asking for an opportunity to discuss wages, working conditions and a union contract. The letters were not answered. The workers then publicly announced that they would strike if employers refused to enter into bargaining. The employers did not respond. On September 8, 1965, somewhere in the neighborhood of 600-800 farm workers (mostly Filipinos) went on strike in an attempt to force bargaining.

The issue of supporting the strike was now raised for other workers in the Delano harvest. On September 16, 1965, approximately 1,100 Mexican-American farm workers met in Delano under the leadership of the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA). They voted to join the strike. On September 19th, AWOC and NFWA agreed to work together and set up a joint strike committee. On September 20, 1965, more than 1,200 Mexican-American farm workers joined the strike. Nearly half of the 5,000 harvest hands were on strike on this date.

Instead of bargaining with their workers, many of whom have worked faithfully for them for two decades or more, the struck employers began a systematic effort to recruit replacements (strikebreakers).

The pattern of the strike from that day on has been picketing and community organization work by the unions to get strikebreakers to join the strike and recruitment by employers to continue the harvest and most recently to get pruning done in preparation for the 1966 harvest.

The Leaders of the Strike

The director of AWOC is Al Green. His offices are in Stockton. The local organizer in Delano is Larry Itliong. He has lived in Delano for six (6) years, is Filipino and has a close relationship with the workers that extends over a number of years.

The director of the NFWA is Cesar Chavez. As a member of a migrant family he spent much time in Delano. Four (4) years ago this spring he resigned as national organizer for the Community Service Organization (CSO) and moved (with his wife and eight (8) children) to Delano to build a grass roots farm worker organization that would be completely supported by its members.

Some Important Events in the Strike

- 1) Harrassment against strikers in the early weeks included: one picket deliberately knocked down by a car, shooting at a picket sign, physical assault on several picketers by growers or their employees, "dusting" of pickets with sulphur spray,

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

THE CHURCH AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE-A PARTIAL REPORT (continued)

- dust storm created next to pickets by fast moving tractors and cultivators, hundreds of photographs taken of picketers by police, filthy insults directed at women on the picket line, contemptuous and bigoted remarks directed at Mexican-Americans on the picket lines, stopping of cars of strikers and their friends by police with questioning, searching and photographing. The police have resisted most efforts to press charges against employers and their managerial personnel.
- 2) It is known that three growers were deliberately run down by a car driven by a Filipino worker. He has been tried and convicted. Workers have been accused of burning grape boxes and stakes and of using violence and threats to harrass strikebreakers. As a matter of fact violence by workers has been minimal thanks to training and leadership in non-violence provided by the strike leaders, churchmen and volunteers from CORE and SNCC. On December 16 the mayor of Delano publicly thanked the strikers for their non-violent methods.
 - 3) September 22-23, 1965-Visit by observation team from the California Church Council. They saw strikebreakers leaving the fields as a result of picketing and were "dusted" by fast moving tractors. They talked to all sides and issued a statement calling for negotiations.
 - 4) October 17, 1965-Migrant Ministry staff person, the Rev. David Havens was arrested by the Kern County Sheriff for reading Jack London's definition of a strikebreaker to strikebreakers. He was standing on public property and volunteered to read in place of a worker who had been warned by the sheriff not to speak or read to the workers. The case against Mr. Havens was dismissed by a Bakersfield judge on the grounds that the arrest violated his constitutional right of free speech.
 - 5) October 19, 1965-Forty-four (44) persons including nine (9) clergymen were arrested in Kern County for shouting "Huelga" to strikebreakers in the fields. The same activity was at that time legal in Tulare County and is now acceptable in both Kern and Tulare Counties. The trials are pending.
 - 6) Statement by the Delano Ministerial Association criticizing visiting clergymen and stating that "such controversial matters (as the Delano strike) should be handled through proper and established channels that justice and peace might prevail." A later public statement "deplored the unethical tactics of the Migrant Ministry" (no details were supplied).
 - 7) December 13-14, 1965-Visit to Delano by eleven Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish leaders of national stature. They issued a statement supporting the workers in their strike efforts and calling for negotiations. A planned luncheon meeting with growers did not take place. The churchmen were present, but growers were not. A dispute continues as to which group was at fault for the communications breakdown.
 - 8) December 14, 1965-The city manager of Delano recommended that the City Council call in the State Conciliation Service to mediate the strike. On December 20 the the City Council refused, arguing that to call for mediation would be to take sides with the workers since the growers do not want negotiations.
 - 9) December 16, 1965-Visit to Delano by the United Auto Workers' president, Walter Reuther. Approximately 900 striking workers were on hand to greet him at a rally. The UAW pledged financial support to the strikers. Jim Drake and Dave Havens were assaulted by a local grower the day of Reuther's visit. The grower was arrested and charged.
 - 10) Late December-Announcement by NFWA of a national boycott against Schenley Products and Delano grapes. Schenley owns one of the ranches being struck.
 - 11) January 27, 1966-A freak accident took the life of NFWA worker Roger Terrones. The Rev. Jim Drake led the workers in a memorial service in Delano that day.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

THE CHURCH AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE-A PARTIAL REPORT (continued)

- 12) January 28, 1966-A Visalia court denied a permanent injunction against picketing by AWOC and NFWA on the docks in San Francisco, Oakland and Stockton. DiGiorgio Corporation had been granted a temporary injunction against such picketing after shipments of grapes were stopped at the docks when Longshoremen refused to cross the picket lines.
- 13) Picketing continues in Delano during the pruning season. On an average day, 80 pickets are on the line. Only rarely do non-workers appear on the picket lines at this stage in the strike. Strikebreakers are being recruited from Los Angeles, Santa Maria, Texas, Mexico, etc. In many cases they are not being told that there is a strike. This is a violation of the law. The Chamisal recruitment office in El Paso, Texas has publicly admitted recruiting 200 workers for Delano. As strikebreakers leave the fields under the pressure of picketing, there is an effort to replace them with new strikebreakers. There is no indication that employers are considering negotiations as an alternative to the present conflict.

////

The next issue of the opinion will carry the last half of this article, in which the Rev. Hartmire answers several specific questions concerning the involvement of the Church in this dispute.

*

*

*

A CRITICAL VIEW
OF MR. TERPSTRA'S CRITICAL VIEW OF CONSERVATISM

by Thomas B. Talbott

"One of the great ironies of our age is that nearly all the bad consequences of government intervention are attributed to free enterprise."

I am indebted to Gene Terpstra for his penetrating critique of my essay, A Conservative View of the Moral Limits of Government, and would like to address myself to his criticisms, some of which are incisive indeed, but others of which are both confused and confusing. I am particularly interested in Mr. Terpstra's charge that I have oversimplified the issues, for this is precisely my response to his generalizations.

Mr. Terpstra rightly observes that in section iv I failed to develop a coherent argument, that I did not define my terms in context, and that I chose words with a particular emotional appeal. What he fails to observe is that I was not developing an argument (i.e., reasoning from premises to conclusions), but outlining a point of view. My intention in section iv was to crystalize certain sloganized sentiments of the man-in-the-street conservative into intellectually defensible generalizations, which generalizations admittedly presuppose answers to a whole series of economic, ethical, and philosophical questions. In this regard, Mr. Terpstra complains of my failure to use language that is emotionally neutral, but I doubt that such an ideal is possible, or desirable, and certainly Mr. Terpstra's language is far from emotionally neutral. Observe the following:

In the history of free enterprise, whenever and wherever the market has been really free, there have usually been detrimental effects ranging

CONTINUED ON PAGE 7

THOMAS TALBOTT is a Senior at FTS. He graduated in 1964 from Portland State College with a B.S. in Philosophy.

A CRITICAL VIEW OF MR. TERPSTRA'S CRITICAL VIEW OF CONSERVATISM (continued)

from inconvenience to visciousness. In a short space it would be impossible to give a definitive list and examples of these effects, but several categories can be noted. Cutthroat competition, leading to survival of the fittest (i.e., the most powerful or most ruthless).¹ Monopolies--in pricing as well as in production. Price fixing.... Industry's refusal to eliminate practices which create health hazards.../ my italics_/.

That Mr. Terpstra should couch these generalities in such emotional language is not in itself bad provided that he knows what he is doing. As an interpretive point of view, the above passage is acceptable; but as an argument, it is devoid of logical force. (1) Cutthroat competition: The genius of a market economy is precisely the manner in which it virtually eliminates all cutthroat competition. The only competition under free enterprise is the competition to fulfill the wants of the greatest number of people at the cheapest possible price. One who accumulates wealth is therefore one who contributes to the standard of living of the masses; and wherever the market has been relatively free from interference, the poor have been lifted to a standard of living higher than the well to do under other systems. (2) Monopoly: The problem of monopoly is incredibly complex, but if Mr. Terpstra wants to introduce monopoly as evidence for his point of view, he should at least show himself knowledgeable of the conditions under which monopoly prices become profitable. (a) It is, ironically, the curtailment of Mr. Terpstra's hated competition that makes monopoly possible. (b) The existence of monopoly, regardless of what kind of monopoly, is of no detrimental significance except in so far as it makes it possible for one to restrict his services and establish monopoly prices. (c) With the rare exception of a few limited space monopolies, the rule is that the free market discourages monopoly prices because newcomers are always free to take advantage of the monopolist's restriction of services. (d) Margin monopoly is no exception to this rule because there is always the possibility of competition between large businesses, and if 'monopoly prices prevail in the sale of the products of big-size business, the reasons are either patents or monopoly in the ownership of mines or other sources of raw materials / such as diamonds_/ or cartels based on tariffs."² In short, if Mr. Terpstra is concerned about monopoly prices, he should "raise the question of what obstacles restrain people from challenging the monopolists. In answering this question one discovers the role played in the emergence of monopoly prices by institutional factors."³ Historically, the most harmful monopolies have been caused by tariffs and in some instances patents. (3) Price fixing (non-government): This is either an irrelevancy or a redundancy, because price fixing either involves fraud or it does not. If it does, then it is not a market phenomenon and clearly subject to government reprisal; if it does not, then at the very worst it is merely an attempt to set a monopoly price. (4) Health hazards: Another irrelevancy, because economic freedom does not entail the freedom to deface another's property, trample underfoot his rights, or pollute his atmosphere. One cannot justify shooting bullets through another's house on the ground that he is standing on his own property. Economic freedom entails freedom of contract, not chaos. One of the proper functions of government is the maintenance of order, and in so far as anti-pollution or anti-smog measures are necessary, they are proper so long as they "affect all potential producers equally and are not used as an indirect way of controlling prices and quantities."⁴

One of the great ironies of our age is that nearly all the bad consequences of government intervention are attributed to free enterprise. This is tragic because those hurt are inevitably economic minorities. "Pro-labor" legislation, for instance,

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8

A CRITICAL VIEW OF MR. TERPSTRA'S CRITICAL VIEW OF CONSERVATISM (continued)
is literally killing Negroes. In his excellent analysis of the racial problem, Charles E. Silberman notes that "to the Negro, labor acts as a conservative establishment primarily concerned with maintaining the job monopolies of its members."⁵ These job monopolies, rendered possible by such interventionist policies as forced union membership and minimum wages, enable the working man to raise his standard of living not at the expense of the rich, but at the expense of the unemployed who are not permitted to challenge the monopolists. What happens is this: On an unhampered market, the interplay of supply and demand would theoretically reduce wages to a level at which all those willing to work can work, but when wage scales are forced higher than the market would set them, the inevitable result is unemployment. Since the conservative's presumption is in favor of free enterprise, he would solve the problem by eliminating minimum wages and passing right to work laws. Lord Keynes, however, suggested creating jobs by federal spending, financed by credit expansion. This works because it causes inflation, thereby lowering real wages back down to the market level (you can't defeat the market!), thus completing the circle. But from a conservative point of view, the Keynesian solution merely compounds the problem. To solve a problem created by intervention with more intervention is merely to create more problems to be solved with further intervention. Thus the Keynesian solution commits one to a policy of continually rising prices, a policy which again hurts minorities. Dr. Colin Clark, Director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute at Oxford, has well stated the objection to such a policy.

There are a large number of people with fixed, or comparatively fixed incomes--who have certainly done nothing to deserve the viscious injustice of having the real value of their incomes eroded away by rising prices. They include many of the poorest in the community, pensioners, widows and others.... It is the poorest who must perforce put their savings into insurance policies, savings banks and the like. Any economist..who deliberately commits himself to a policy of continually rising prices...is guilty of one of the meanest of all possible actions, namely, deliberately robbing the savings of the poor and the old.⁶

What I should like to stress in all this is that, even if the conservative's defense of the free market is naive, it is not intentionally viscious. He defends free enterprise not in the name of self-interest, a la Ayn Rand, but in the name of freedom and utility. The conservative must not, of course, become doctrinaire. When thinking politically, one thinks in terms of presumptions, not absolutes. The conservative presumption favors free enterprise because, unlike interventionism, and unlike socialism, free enterprise makes the buying public sovereign, and therefore reduces the possibility of exploitation. When the entrepreneur's success is ultimately determined by the buying public, everyone who buys influences the market.⁷

On the other hand, one must not deny the plain fact that the free market requires of man a mobility and openness to change which is sometimes difficult for him. At this point Mr. Terpstra catches me in a bit of sloppy writing (see footnote 2). I should have pointed out that such inhuman effects of the free market as there are must be compared to the greater hardships--usually to minorities--caused by intervention. As the problem of monopoly illustrates, intervention tends to pit man against man. Nevertheless, a humane society will seek to mitigate the hardships of job mobility, "but without upsetting the needed elimination of the unfit from the specific position in which they failed," for such elimination is necessary if each individual is to find that niche in society where he is able, given his own particular talents, to contribute most to the common good.⁸ This is what I meant by "ultimate solution." It is unfair to the poor to condone inefficiency, for efficiency in production is the very

A CRITICAL VIEW OF MR. TERPSTRA'S CRITICAL VIEW OF CONSERVATISM (continued)

thing which makes goods available to the poor. This is why the remedial policies adopted should be designed to adjust personnel to the requirements of the market. In Boston, Massachusetts, reports William F. Buckley, Jr., there is a Civil War factory producing useless rope which is bought by the government and sold for a loss. When a spokesman from the Hoover Commission suggested that the factory be liquidated, a Liberal Senator caused an uproar. There were, after all, 136 employees working at that plant. To appease the Senator, it was suggested that the plant retain its 136 employees, but cease hiring replacements, so that as the present employees retired the goal of eventual liquidation would be realized without hurting anyone. The Senator was not appeased, and the plant continues to operate. "What is disturbing about the Civil War factory incident is first the sheer stupidity of the thing, second the easy victory of Liberal sentimentalism over reason."⁹

Enemies of human freedom who favor a planned, coercive economy usually support their position by citing examples of immorality in the economic sphere. Since man is a sinful creature, such examples are easily forthcoming. False advertising, fraud, and trickery of all sorts are common place in the dealings of men, and it must be conceded that the worst of all possible errors in formulating a political or economic theory is to underestimate human sinfulness. But what are the implications of human sinfulness for a market economy? Noting that for man's sinful nature is the justification for the existence of government, Mr. Terpstra argues that to be consistent I "must admit that man is no less sinful when operating in economic matters than he is when operating in social matters." From this obvious truth he concludes that "the market cannot go unrestrained any more than government or human nature can."¹⁰ Now whatever Mr. Terpstra means by "the market," it is evident that he does not mean what the laissez-faire economists mean by the term. "The market" is really nothing but a process of adjustments on the part of individuals to those demands of mutual economic cooperation presupposed by the doctrine of freedom of contract. It is a process according to the laws of which a free man must live if he is to benefit himself not at the expense of others, but by serving others. The requirements of mutual cooperation reflect themselves in price structures which are the basis of economic calculation, and which enable one to determine how he can best fulfill the wants of others. To be sure, these price structures are influenced by laws designed to restrain immorality (e.g., laws against killing may affect the sale of guns), but since such laws do not coercively control prices and quantities (which control inevitably destroy the possibility of economic calculation), market values remain largely the product of the interplay of non-moral factors. However, by "the market" Mr. Terpstra apparently does not mean "a non-moral interplay of supply and demand, profits and losses, prices, wages, and production costs," but rather "a sinful nature subject to government restraint"--he either means this or he has not drawn a true implication of my theory. But all this is based upon a mistake. The market is not a free moral agent, capable of making decisions which are socially atavistic and subject to government restraint. The market is by definition ethically neutral, for only individuals are moral agents. Of course human sinfulness must be restrained in all spheres of life, but when government legislates against immorality, it is not interfering with the market, but protecting it from interference. The market requires freedom, and freedom requires order, and sin is inconsistent with all three; thus, laws against immorality are necessary if the market is to function at all.

Here, then, is a necessary function of government. Since original sin affects man's behavior in economic matters, government is necessary to protect the market from sabotage by those who prefer the methods of coercion and deceit to the requirements of economic cooperation. Sinners rarely respect the freedom of others, so gov-

CHRISTMAS MORNING, 1965 NORTHERN MANITOBA

by A. William Roberts

The sun filled the east with oranges for Christmas morning.
The dog barked; snowflakes fell on the ice.

Come into the church, bong bong, please,
Leave the husky dog at the steps.
Come into the Church, leave behind the paper from the presents
And worship the Christ child.

The bishop will be heard from in the letter,
But leave on your rubbers,
Since the janitor was a little late today.
Good morning Merry Christmas the same to you
The door scrapes shut, the floor boards bend.
Genuflect, then go to your pew behind the pillar
That leans, tired of the years its held
The Kingdom of God on Earth in place.

Pray, Alice and Jim, Doris with Eddy and Walter,
That the Virgin Mary will get up from where she's
Sitting in the creche,
To say the Magnificat in person,
While the dove from the fresco flaps its wings
And scatters feathers over the congregation to be taken home,
And the Christ child leaves his swaddling clothes
On your knees.

* * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT FACULTY PUBLICATIONS

- Dr. Edward John Carnell, Professor of Ethics and Philosophy of Religion: "Has the Queen Abdicated?," review of New Directions in Theology Today, Volume I: Introduction, by William Hordern, and Volume II: History and Hermeneutics by Carl E. Braaten, Christianity Today, November 25, 1966, pp. 28-29.
- Dr. George E. Ladd, Professor of New Testament Theology and Exegesis: "Review of Paul, Apostle of Liberty, by Richard N. Longenecker," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, Vol. 9 (Fall, 1966), p. 199.

* * *

* * * * *

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS is a Junior at FTS. He graduated from Wheaton College in 1962 with an AB in English.

UNSUNG REFRAIN FOR AN OLD MAN

by William Walker

When time has bowed your hoary head
Upon her beating breast
And grains of sand yet slower flow
Into their measured course

What is it to thee--Old Man?

What is it
That your flowing mane
Should touch earth's sorrows in gentle caress
When for ages it has streamed
In the vigor of your race.

Weep not!

For you WON it--Old Man!
You won tenfold the course before you
And you never even knew it
Since your race never ended
With bowed head
And bow'd back.

It just began in twilight
For this too was your life
And the stakes had doubled with the fleeting day.

This is your gold--Old Man
The sky is your stature
For you are yet the MAN!

And we watched with astonishment your ancient visage
That lowered not its failing gaze
But grappled still
For that eternity of meaning
We only so casually have sought.

And we knew our stakes were too low!

Ah, But run strong--Old Man!
For that is your crown.

We will be your legacy!

WILLIAM WALKER is a Senior at FTS. He received a B.A. in history from Wheaton College in 1963.

A CRITICAL VIEW OF MR. TERPSTRA'S CRITICAL VIEW OF CONSERVATISM (continued)
ernment is necessary to protect that freedom.

////

1. Mr. Terpstra's distaste for competition is curious in view of his inference a few sentences later that government intervention is necessary to insure competition.
2. Ludwig von Mises, Human Action, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), p. 368.
3. Ibid.
4. Friedrich A. Hayek, The Road to Serfdom, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 37.
5. Crisis in Black and White, (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 218.
6. "'Growthmanship': Fact and Fallacy," Intercollegiate Review, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January, 1965), 6.
7. The "argument" about the poor paying more for the same goods (due to credit charges) is not really an argument. No one denies that the rich are materially better off than the poor. It is obvious that if one has more money, he can buy in bulk and avoid time payments, but this is hardly exploitation. That the opportunity to buy on credit is a service for which one must pay only means that one should thank a booming economy for another service made available to the poor. On a free market the wealth of one man is never the cause of another's poverty, and the only significant question is whether in the long run the poor would be better off under some other arrangement. The answer is no.
8. Karl Brandt, "Moral Presuppositions of the Free Enterprise Economy," Intercollegiate Review, Vol. 2, No. 2 (October, 1965), 115.
9. Up From Liberalism, (New York: Hillman Books, 1961), p. 216.
10. A chilling confession is Mr. Terpstra's admission that were he to choose between the market and government he "would have to side with the government." I say chilling because, although the market has produced many a tightwad businessman, it has yet to produce a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin. Equally startling is Mr. Terpstra's suggestion that the conservative's defense of free enterprise renders "the ideals of the Bill of Rights forever unattainable." I suppose, however, that in a society where Hallmark Hall of Fame is able to get away with portraying Socrates as a champion of democracy, we should grant Mr. Terpstra the liberty of portraying the Bill of Rights as an attempt to limit not the government, but free enterprise.
11. On this point see Arthur Kemp, "The Market Has No Morals," Intercollegiate Review, Vol. 2, No. 2 (October, 1965).

*

*

*

the opinion staff

Richard A. Bower.....Editor-in-chief
David K. Garth.....Managing Editor
Richard W. Burr.....Literary Editor
Terry A. Simonson.....Consultant Editor
Thomas F. Johnson.....Consultant Editor
Margo Griffin.....Typist

Opinions expressed in articles and letters are those of the authors and are not to be construed as the view of the Seminary, faculty, student council, or editors of the opinion.