

SPECTRUM

a quarterly journal of the association of adventist forums

SPECTRUM VOLUME ONE NUMBER THREE SUMMER 1969

summer 1969

**ASSOCIATION OF
ADVENTIST FORUMS
BOARD**

PRESIDENT

ALVIN L. KWIRAM, Harvard University

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ROY BRANSON, Andrews University

PRESIDENT-ELECT

TOM L. WAITERS, Loma Linda University

MEMBERS

DAVID CLARIDGE, Stanford University

DONALD E. HALL, Walla Walla College

RONALD L. NUMBERS, Andrews University

JACK W. PROVONSHA, Loma Linda University

CHARLES T. SMITH, JR., University of Michigan

CHARLES T. STOKES, University of Bridgeport

BUSINESS MANAGER

BILL H. SIMMONS, Loma Linda University Church

PROMOTION MANAGER

DON R. HAMER, La Sierra Academy

EDITORIAL BOARD

MOLLEURUS COUPERUS, Loma Linda University, *Chairman*

ALVIN L. KWIRAM, Harvard University

BILL H. SIMMONS, Loma Linda University Church

OTILLIE F. STAFFORD, Atlantic Union College

BRUCE E. TRUMBO, California State College, Hayward

VERNE V. WEHTJE, Pacific Union College

GRADUATE STUDENT

The Association of Adventist Forums is a nonprofit, nonsubsidized organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals, and voluntary efforts of contributors and staff.

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views that the individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

SPECTRUM / Volume One, Number Three / Summer 1969

EDITORIAL STAFF

MOLLEURUS COUPERUS, Editor
OTILIE F. STAFFORD, Associate Editor
VERNE V. WEHTJE, Associate Editor
FRITZ GUY, Assistant Editor
BRUCE E. TRUMBO, Book Review Editor
JERILYN EMORI, Editorial Assistant
MADELYNN L. HALDEMAN, Editorial Assistant

CONSULTING EDITORS

GODFREY T. ANDERSON, Loma Linda University
NIELS-ERIK ANDREASEN, Vanderbilt University §
FREDERICK D. CHANDLER, Oakland University
JAMES J. C. COX, Andrews University
THOMAS S. GERATY, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
GEORGE T. HARDING IV, Harding Hospital
ARTHUR HAUCK, Union College
RAY HEFFERLIN, Southern Missionary College
NORBERT HUGEDE, Seminarie Adventiste du Saleve
LOUIS E. JENKINS, University of Southern California §
LYLE H. JENSEN, University of Washington
KENNETH R. MacKINTOSH, Walla Walla College
FREDERICK G. MEYER, Columbia University §
J. CARL MOTSCHIEDLER, Fresno, California, Law Practice
ERNEST J. PLATA, National Institutes of Health
D. S. PORTER, Oxford University
RICHARD M. RITLAND, Andrews University
A. J. H. SMART, Teachers College, Armidale, Australia
BRUCE E. TRUMBO, California State College, Hayward
KARLHEINZ WOEBER, University of Bonn

JAMES E. YODER, Circulation Manager

GRADUATE STUDENT §

SPECTRUM is a journal published quarterly (winter, spring, summer, and autumn) at Loma Linda, California, by the Association of Adventist Forums.

Correspondence should be directed to *SPECTRUM*, Box 866, Loma Linda, California 92354: *manuscripts and letters* to the attention of the EDITOR; change of address (with the latest label) and *subscriptions* to the CIRCULATION MANAGER. Correspondence about *book reviews* should be sent to the BOOK REVIEW EDITOR at the address noted on the last page of the Reviews section.

Subscription rate: one year, \$7.00; student, \$5.00. Single copy, \$2.50. Remittance should be by check to the Association of Adventist Forums.

No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the Editor.

POSTMASTER: please send notice of undeliverable copies on form 3547 to *SPECTRUM*, Box 866, Loma Linda, California 92354.

CONTENTS

4	KENNETH R. MACKINTOSH	Christos
5	RICHARD HAMMILL	The Church <i>Does</i> Need a Law School
12	JAMES J. LONDIS	The Silent Word
14	EARLE HILGERT	Theological Dimensions of the Christian Doctrine of Creation
22	HERSCHEL HUGHES	Hunger
24	ALVIN L. KWIRAM	The Occupation of University Hall
33	DONALD E. HALL	On Being a Seven-Day Scientist
37	DIRK K. KOOPMANS	Sheaf
38	GREGORY R. WISE	Götterdämmerung
39	VICTOR A. HERVIG	Operation Dare
44	WILFRED M. HILLOCK	Tuition Rates in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges
51	M. JERRY DAVIS	The Puritans and the Sabbath
56	KENNETH R. MACKINTOSH	The Peaceable Kingdom

REVIEWS:

57	CHARLES W. TEEL, JR.	The Mennonites and Social Responsibility
64	ARTHUR HAUCK	The Ultimate Concern?
65	R. EDWARD JOHNSON	A Story of Friendship
67	PAUL O. CAMPBELL	How Can Man Find God?
72		Brief Reviews
75		Letters
78		Notes on Contributors



Christos . . . KEN MACKINTOSH

The Church *Does* Need a Law School

RICHARD HAMMILL

5

A group of Seventh-day Adventist lawyers recently took the position that the church does not need its own law school, because its young people can study law in existing schools without encountering insurmountable problems of Sabbath observance or ideological and philosophical problems that threaten their religious beliefs. But such factors are not the primary reasons why Seventh-day Adventists operate various professional and graduate schools. Some of the major reasons a Seventh-day Adventist school of law should be established are as follows.

I

More Adventist lawyers are needed, not only to add financial strength to the church, but primarily to give status to the church in thousands of cities and towns across the United States. In the eyes of millions of people in this country, Adventists are considered to be uninformed, narrow-minded sectarians and obscurantists. Ministers preach and laymen witness to their faith in a setting of outright hostility or deadening indifference, because so many people look on Adventists either as fanatical or as so far out of touch with the times that they are unworthy of a hearing.

The presence of a skilled, hardworking, dedicated physician in a community can offset prejudice against the church and create a favorable climate in which ministers may get a hearing and laymen may witness effectively to their neighbors. In exactly the same way, a respected Seventh-day Adventist lawyer — or a judge — can offset prejudice and create a favorable impression. His influence in a community is fully as great as that of a medical doctor.

In order to obtain an adequate number of physicians to exert this leaven-

ing influence in the communities of America, many decades ago the church established a school of medicine. Without it, we would have some Adventist doctors, but not nearly enough. Indeed, we are still far short of an adequate number, but the shortage would be much greater if there had been no Adventist medical school.

Likewise, the church will never have the needed large number of lawyers and judges unless we establish a law school. We may continue to have a scattering of Adventist lawyers — in California and in a few other areas with extremely favorable climatic and economic conditions. But this is not enough. The counties and communities of the fifty states of America will not have Adventist lawyers and judges even within the next century unless the church establishes a school of law that will encourage far larger numbers of Adventist youth to enter the legal profession.

For decades it has been possible for Adventist students to undertake graduate studies and earn graduate degrees in dozens of disciplines without encountering unsolvable Sabbath-observance problems or undergoing undue philosophical or ideological tension. Yet for a long time Adventist schools, both in the United States and abroad, were able to obtain the services of only a minute fraction of the needed number of teachers with advanced degrees. I used to sit week after week with the appointees committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists as it struggled to fill positions in overseas secondary schools and colleges in countries where resident visas are not granted to American teachers unless they have graduate degrees. The members of this committee regularly clamored at the doors of the General Conference department of education for names of degreed young Adventists who could fill these positions. But they clamored in vain, because such people did not exist. Until recent years even in this country, Adventist secondary schools had few teachers with advanced degrees.

In order to meet this desperate need, the church began offering various programs of graduate education. There was an immediate response by Adventist students. They were not students of low ability who could not get into other graduate schools; they were students who had not been interested in or challenged to undertake graduate education. The initiation of Adventist graduate programs clearly had a pump-priming effect, causing hundreds of young people, who would never have done so otherwise, to go on to graduate education not only in Adventist graduate schools but also in public universities.

In other words, the development of Adventist graduate programs helped to effect a change in attitude and expectancy toward graduate education on

the part of the young people, their parents, and employing organizations of the church. As a result, Adventist elementary and secondary schools in this country and overseas now have hundreds of teachers with graduate degrees. Moreover, dozens of those who took advanced study at Adventist graduate schools, and who would have done no graduate work at all if these schools had not been in existence, learned to enjoy graduate study and proceeded to universities that offer the doctor of philosophy degree and professional doctoral degrees. This trend has helped Adventist colleges to alleviate the shortage of teachers with doctoral degrees.

One reason why I believe the Seventh-day Adventist church needs a law school, therefore, is that I think it will create among hundreds of students great interest in preparing for a career in law, with the result that there will be lawyers and judges to create a favorable climate of opinion toward the Seventh-day Adventist church in communities across the country.

II

Another reason for establishing an Adventist law school is that the members, educators, and ministers of the church need to have full explication of the place of law in Adventist religious philosophy. Confusion about this permeates all levels of the church. Great educational benefit would accrue from the presence of a body of Adventist legal practitioners, scholars, and researchers who could engage in dialogue with Adventist theologians involved in the preparation of future ministers and with Adventist professional educators preparing future teachers. From this dialogue the educators and ministers of the church could gain a more adequate view of the place law holds in all areas of life — including religion.

I do not mean to imply religious legalism. The Adventist message to the world is a message of grace — a message of a God who is rich in mercy, always ready to forgive, whose love and compassion are great enough to encompass all men. However, God whose love is everlasting has a program for the world that can be achieved only as men become willing to live, and learn to live, in harmony with his moral and ethical plans for men. Pervading the religious and intellectual world today is a sort of antinomian, generalistic, amorphous outlook that leads people to rely on subjective impressions for their understanding of how they ought to live, and to trust in ecstatic or impulsive feelings as a measure of the validity of their religious experience.

In this setting it is important that the law of God be correctly understood. Adventist theologians have struggled with this problem, but they have en-

gaged in their inquiry without the benefit of specialists who understand the place of law in the fabric of man's life. This search for broader understanding of the place of law in theology, this effort to relate law and Christianity, must reach both ways. Professors of law in an Adventist law school, legal experts, and legal researchers can help theologians understand the function of law in religious life. Conversely, the benefit of dialogue and interaction with theologians will broaden the view of Adventist lawyers in regard to the function of religion in the day-by-day practice of law.

Too many lawyers approach law in a completely secular framework. The place of law in society can be understood in a more realistic manner in the light of Christian doctrine and the divine claim upon man. The church can give relevance to its teachings by a clear understanding of law as it pertains to vital areas of life and society. The Christian lawyer should be able to study his discipline in a setting that will help him see the basic relationship between law and Christianity. This will help him achieve integrity and avoid a devitalizing split between his personal and his professional life.

III

Dialogue and interaction among church theologians and legal educators would help also to clarify and rectify basic legal-ethical philosophy, much of which is inconsistent with Christianity. Most law schools are pervaded by one of two basic legal philosophies. The first and perhaps the more widespread is that of *legal positivism*, which attempts to insulate law from morality; the second is *ethical relativism*, which reduces morality to a matter of personal opinion and cultural history. The Christian lawyer rejects these viewpoints because he believes that law is neither merely a means by which the powerful impose their will on the remainder of the community nor merely an expression of majority opinion or the morality of the largest group.

The Christian lawyer will believe that criticism of rules of law may be necessary and that such criticism is not merely an expression of subjective preference. He will seek to relate Christianity and law, and in doing so he will seek for a Christian philosophy of law or "for a Christian basis for discriminating among philosophies of law." He will try to find a Christian ethical standard for criticizing particular laws and a Christian understanding of the process of criticism. He will be unwilling to accept any statute uncritically, because he knows that there are just laws and unjust laws. He will not be willing to accept the idea that "law is law," because his conscience tells him that at times there is lawlessness in statutory form.

The Christian is not willing to accept Chief Justice Holmes' definition of law as simply a "prophecy of what the courts will do," for this says in effect that legal theory is not obliged to provide any basis for determining the justice or injustice of a law. This concept, however, has become a fundamental concept in modern jurisprudence. One of the most influential legal theorists of our day argues in his major treatise that "the concept of law has no moral connotations whatsoever."¹

This separation obscures the very nature of law, since law, the means by which human conduct is controlled, involves ethics and morality. "An adequate theory of law must be broad enough to deal with all the facts relating to the phenomenon of law including the fact of value."² Christian theologians and Christian lawyers have always sought to broaden the context within which law is studied, so that justice and morality can be a part of law.

If law is defined as "a consciously formulated norm of behavior enforced by the power of the state, and directed toward achieving certain ends," several crucial questions arise.³ The first of these is the *source* of law. From where did law come? is there a source of law prior even to the legislator or the judge? what is the nature of law? The Christian brings to this first question his understanding that the source of law, like the source of man, is God. Law is an extension of God's will and of God's order; it "has the effect of fashioning man by ordering his conduct."⁴

For theology holds that the original justice is man's spontaneous right relation to man and things as well as to God. Thus, the first edition of the law lies in God's creative act wherein he forms man to live the life of love. The second edition of the law is the decalogue which is a more specific (but less dynamic) elaboration of the life man ought to live. Whereas the life of love would lead man to relate himself properly to his fellow man, his actual prideful life obscures his duty and the specific instructions of the commandments become necessary. Subsequently, the "secular" law follows the general direction of these commandments, though now deprived of their theological basis. For example, "Thou shalt not steal" is expanded into the more intricate Law of Property; "Thou shalt not bear false witness" lurks behind the Law of Contracts; "Thou shalt not kill" lies behind part of the Criminal Law; "Thou shalt not commit adultery" still represents a fundamental element of the Law of Domestic Relations. That is, law as we know it in the actual legal system is involved in the process of creating the kind of relations God intended in his creative act. The law is misconceived, however, if it is seen simply as force; its essential nature is involved in working toward relations consonant with man's essential nature. To be sure, the coercive aspect of law cannot create the life of love, but its function is chiefly to bring to bear those conditions which will make love possible *and at least to restrain behavior which would obstruct the possibility of mutuality and love.*

The second question is the *nature* of law. Is its essence force, inasmuch as law is enforced by the coercive power of the state? This position is held

in many countries by famous legal theoreticians.⁵ But this would mean that all laws — communist laws, fascist laws, and laws calling for trial by ordeal — are equally valid in that they all possess the element of force. In some systems of government, rights are not actual rights of private persons but rights established by the state. This understanding of the nature of law may result in laws that are flagrantly unjust.

The Seventh-day Adventist church needs a school of law that will educate Adventist lawyers who look upon the essence of law not as force, not as the will of the majority, but as formulations of required conduct that protect the rights and dignity of all human beings. The church needs a law school that will teach practitioners that laws exist to provide for justice.

These are days that have been described by the prophet as a time when justice has fallen in the street. God looks for men who are committed to the upholding of justice. This commitment is even more necessary now than it was in the days of Jeremiah, when the Lord tried to impress the prophet with the value of doing justice and seeking truth. Jeremiah was commanded: "Run to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem; look and take note; search her squares to see if you can find a man, one who does justice and seeks truth, that I may pardon her." Jeremiah did as he was told, but he could not find in the whole city a person who was intent on doing justice and seeking truth. Disappointed, he said to the Lord: "These are only the poor, they have no sense; for they do not know the way of the Lord, the law of their God. I will go to the great, and will speak to them; for they know the way of the Lord, the law of their God."⁶ But even when Jeremiah looked diligently among the educated, the leaders and the great men of Jerusalem, he could not find a person of whom he could conscientiously say, This man *does* justice and *searches* for truth. That tragedy illustrates how rare are the attributes of *doing justice* and *seeking truth*.

The world is full of people who are crying out to *receive* their just rights. There are few people, however, who are concerned that they themselves *do* justice. The distinction between receiving and doing is important: if we do not *receive* justice, that may be someone else's fault; if we do not *do* it, that is our own fault.

IV

No, I would not agree with those who say there is no need for an Adventist law school. We need a school of law that will prepare large numbers of Adventist lawyers and judges to practice in thousands of communities throughout the United States. We need a school of law to help our

church clarify its thinking on the place of law in the fabric of society and in the theology we preach.

We need a school of law to serve as an additional means of helping us realize the importance of a continuing search for truth. The Adventist church, like others, faces the peril of placing value on standardized thought instead of on a continuing, lifelong pursuit of truth. Above all, we need a school of law in which lawyers come to recognize that the function of all law is to produce justice for human beings. We need a school of law that will help impress not only the lawyers among us, but the whole church, that God values persons who are deeply concerned that they themselves do justice.

Jeremiah could not find in all the kingdom of Judah, either among the poor or the great, the learned or the illiterate, a single man who was devoted to doing justice and seeking truth. How much better would Jeremiah have fared if he were to conduct his search in our churches, our colleges, our universities? Are the universities known for sensitivity or courage in matters of justice, or in the earnest search for truth, despite lip service? The silence of the German universities and churches during the rise of nazism has been termed one of the "enigmas" of contemporary history.

The church can never fulfill its high destiny unless by means of its educational institutions it can develop ministers, teachers, and laymen who have a full understanding of the importance of doing justice and seeking truth even though this may bring pain and require breaking with tradition. It is not adequate for the church to be interested in foreign missions and forget its responsibilities to the neighbor next door. The cries of neglected children in the slums, the despair of unemployed fathers who live only a few blocks from our comfortable homes and campuses, cry out for us to do justice and to seek truth. The church should develop every means possible to teach us this need and to help us meet it.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 Hans Kelsen, *The General Theory of Law and State* (translated by Anders Wedberg. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945), p. 5.
- 2 Samuel Enoch Stumpf, Theology and Jurisprudence, *The Christian Scholar* 40, 171 (1957).
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Ibid., 185.
- 5 Kelsen, p. 26.
- 6 Jeremiah 5:1-4.

The Silent Word

*Rusted peaks and green valleys
Witnessed the covenant then
And are here now*

*Would God again
 split rocks
 divide
 waters*

Tear the earth?

*All alone you are
Into the wind
The stationary figure
 in
The swirling dust and blowing mantle*

*Challenger of kings and Gods
In the name of Yahweh*

*The crack of lightning
Answers the whispered prayer
Not throats hoarse from screaming
Or bodies criss-crossed with blood*

*You taunted them well . . .
After all, courage was your virtue*

*Where then did you learn to run, Elijah?
Run from a woman
And from Yahweh*

*Had you forgotten the whisper
The quiet voice
Had you become deaf to God?*

*Only one voice, one voice you hear
Shrill and vengeful
Pursuing you into the wilderness*

*How you have forgotten . . .
Fire and earthquake make you listen
Not the whisper*

*Sky-thunder and jet-whine
Volcano-rumble and tractor-scrape
We hear distinctly*

*We listen to threats of war
And peace
 and elections
 and jazz*

*Can we hear the voice
 of morning
 and twilight
Whose microphone is the wind
Whose platform is the cloud?*

We, the Elijah?

James J. Londis

Theological Dimensions of the Christian Doctrine of Creation

EARLE HILGERT

14

Seventh-day Adventists are rightly interested in the doctrine of creation because of their interest in the *end* of the world. By the very nature of life and time, the assertion of an end implies concern with a beginning. We cannot have an end without a beginning. The fact that Omega is Omega is meaningless unless we recognize the significance of Alpha as being Alpha. To deny a beginning under God is really to negate the possibility of an end under him.

It is Christ who declares himself to be both Alpha and Omega, both "the beginning and the end" (Revelation 21:6; 22:13). In this declaration we are pointed to the basis that distinguishes our whole Christian approach to the question of time and our understanding of creation: *Jesus Christ*. Just as no doctrine can be truly Christian unless it is based in Jesus Christ, so the Christian understanding of creation must turn on our faith in the act of God in him, and our concept of the meaning of creation can be Christian only as it is illumined by our understanding of the plan of salvation. We come, then, to our first basic premise regarding the theology of creation:

Jesus Christ is the basis, the center, and the key to the doctrine of creation.

Emil Brunner stated: "The emphasis on the story of Creation at the beginning of the Bible has constantly led theologians to forsake the rule which they would otherwise follow, namely, that the basis of *all* Christian articles of faith is the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ. So when we begin to study the subject of Creation in the Bible, we ought to start with the first chapter of the Gospel of John, and some other passages of the *New Testament*, and not with the first chapter of Genesis."¹

The fact that many strictly *theological* references in the New Testament

connect creation with the work of Christ indicates that we should begin our understanding of the doctrine of creation with Christ. John 1:3: "All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made." Colossians 1:16, 17: "For in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth . . . all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together." Hebrews 1:2: "But in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world."

If we really take seriously the New Testament conviction that Christ is the center and central focus of history — that he is "the same yesterday and today and forever" (Hebrews 13:8), that he is indeed the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, that in him "all things hold together," that history both before and since the Cross has meaning theologically only in terms of what Christ is and has consummated for us — we come, then, to our second premise:

The whole history of redemption, as told in the Old Testament, is fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

The testimony of New Testament writings supports this second premise: "For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fulness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth" (Ephesians 1:9); "This was according to the eternal purpose which he has realized in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Ephesians 3:11); "The Gospel of God which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy Scriptures" (Romans 1:1, 2); "Everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled" (Luke 24:44, where the technical Jewish terminology for the whole Old Testament is used); "I have not come to abolish [the law and the prophets] but to fulfil them" (Matthew 5:17). The meaning is that Christ is not simply a fulfillment of isolated prophecies (such as Genesis 3:15, Isaiah 7:14, Daniel 9:26), but in a real sense he is the fulfillment of the whole Old Testament: "The law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms." This idea is particularly important when we consider the narrative portions of the Old Testament — even (perhaps we should say, especially) the genealogies, for these establish the continuity, the historical integrity of the Chosen People. This fact is strikingly illustrated by the first chapter of the New Testament, which is a genealogy! Both Matthew and Luke employ such structures to demonstrate that Jesus is the culmination of Old Testament history.

However, to say that Christ is the fulfillment of the Old Testament history

of redemption is only one aspect of a larger picture — that the whole history of Israel *as the covenant people* is a promise and a prefiguring of Christ. This must be seen with eyes of faith in the light of the covenant. The basic promise of the covenant with Israel as God's chosen was made with Abraham (Genesis 12:1, 2; 15:1-6; 17:1-21), but it was at Sinai that the covenant became operative with Israel as a nation. "Now therefore, if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples" (Exodus 19:3-8). The positive and negative aspects of this covenant are spelled out with special clarity in Deuteronomy 29 and 30:

See, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil. If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you this day, by loving the Lord your God, by walking in his ways, and by keeping his commandments and his statutes and his ordinances, then you shall live and multiply, and the Lord your God will bless you in the land which you are entering to take possession of it. But if your heart turns away, and you will not hear, but are drawn away to worship other gods and serve them, I declare to you this day, that you shall perish; you shall not live long in the land which you are going over the Jordan to enter and possess [Deuteronomy 30:15-18].

And when all these things come upon you, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before you, and you call them to mind among all the nations where the Lord your God has driven you, and return to the Lord your God, you and your children, and obey his voice in all that I command you this day, with all your heart and with all your soul; then the Lord your God will restore your fortunes, and have compassion upon you, and he will gather you again from all the peoples where the Lord your God has scattered you [Deuteronomy 30:1-3].

Here the pattern is: (a) if you are faithful to the covenant, you will prosper; (b) if you are unfaithful, you will be punished by the heathen around you; (c) but even then, if you repent, you will be restored. This rhythm becomes the pattern for the writing of the whole history of Israel. It is evident in the successive periods of servitude and freedom narrated in Judges, in the history of Saul and David, and especially in the vicissitudes of the Divided Kingdoms. But its crescendo comes in the mighty epic of the Babylonian captivity and the restoration.

So pronounced is this rhythm that scholars often speak of the books of Samuel and Kings as the Deuteronomic history (cf. 2 Kings 23:25-27). Perhaps even more significantly, from ancient times the Jews spoke of these books not as historical books but as "the former prophets," because the books tell in narrative form essentially the same message that the prophets of Israel proclaim with their constant condemnation of faithlessness, their predictions of doom, and their promises nevertheless of forgiveness and restoration (Isaiah 1-30, Jeremiah and Hosea, Isaiah 40-66, Zechariah).

As seen in the light of the covenant, from the standpoint of this rhythm, the entire history of Israel is the history of redemption, and is a prefiguring and a promise and a prophecy of the experience of every Christian, who finds both judgment and the grace of forgiveness in Jesus Christ. Therefore we can see Christ as the fulfillment and the real meaning of the whole Old Testament.

Now we have said (1) that Christ is the center and meaning of history, and (2) that the whole history of Israel is fulfilled in him. But what is the relation of this concept to creation? Creation was not the creation just of the Chosen People, but of the world. Creation was *before* sin. How then can creation be seen as related to the history of redemption, and especially to Christ, who is the Saviour? Where is the theological possibility of the New Testament assertion that Christ is both Saviour and Creator?

Looked at from the central theme of the Old Testament — the covenant focusing on Christ to come — the Genesis creation story is clearly the setting: the overture to the drama that is to be played out in the history of the covenant people. The story of creation is not told merely for its own sake. It is told for the sake of the narrative of salvation that is to follow. Just here the truly significant difference between the Babylonian and Canaanite myths of creation and the biblical narrative of creation becomes evident. The old Semitic myths are *cosmogonies*; that is, they are narratives whose primary intent is to explain how the world and mankind came to be. They are concerned first of all with the question "How did the world get here?" The question is asked not so much from a desire for factual information (which desire by itself was largely foreign to the Semitic mind) as from a desire for understanding. Characteristically of Semitic thought patterns, this understanding was conveyed not by philosophical language, but by the telling of a myth.

Now the great difference between myth-telling and the biblical account of creation lies in the fact that the primary concern of the Genesis story is not to answer the question of origins, but to assert the primacy, the uniqueness of the Lord, who is the covenant God of Israel. The Genesis account is a testimony to the realization that if the covenant relation with God is really what Israel believed it to be, the author must be the creator of heaven and earth. The Israelites never wrote a formal creed; but if they had, its first article assuredly would not have read, "I believe in Jehovah the creator, and he is our God." It would rather have followed the thought order in the Ten Commandments: "I am the Lord (Jehovah) your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt. . . . In six days the Lord made heaven and

earth" (Exodus 20:2, 11). The Israelite did not base his covenant relation with the Lord on belief in the Lord as Creator; but he based his belief in the Lord as creator on his covenant relation.

That is, the creation story in Genesis performs a function different from that of the pagan myths of creation. It is intended as an integral part of the history of the Chosen People. It is a logically necessary overture to the story of redemption. (The much debated question of whether Genesis 1 is poetry or prose is probably largely irrelevant to our understanding of its meaning.) But the relation of the Genesis story to the subsequent history of redemption means that its full comprehension is possible only in the light of that history, and particularly as it climaxes in Jesus Christ. Thus Karl Barth declared: "But according to this witness [that is, Genesis 1] the purpose and therefore the meaning of creation is to make possible the history of God's covenant with man which has its beginning, its centre and its culmination in Jesus Christ. The history of this covenant is as much the goal of creation as creation itself is the beginning of this history."²

Next, in John 1 we have the primary Christian interpretation of the doctrine of creation.

In the beginning. These are the words of Genesis 1:1; without question John had this verse in mind when he wrote. It is futile to ask whether he refers to the beginning of creation week or to some more remote time, as he is not concerned with that distinction. In view of the verses that follow, he is simply saying: "Before anything that has been created existed, the Word was existing." These words, then, like Genesis 1:1, are an assertion of the primacy of the Lord over all creation.

The Word. In Greek the Word is, of course, the *Logos*. The Logos was an old and important concept in Greek philosophy, where, though varying from one philosopher to another in details, it represented the general notion of the mind which shaped the inanimate stuff of the universe into an ordered cosmos. John borrowed the term, but his use can never be understood on the basis of Greek philosophy alone. We must go rather to the Old Testament, and especially to Genesis 1. The Logos of John 1:1 finds an echo in the oft-repeated *wayyō' mer elōhîm*, "and God said," of Genesis 1 (cf. Psalm 33:6, 9). It is in this context that the great difference between the Logos of philosophy and that of John becomes apparent: the Greek Logos is only a demiurge, a world-architect working with eternally existing matter. He stands alongside his "creation:" in the ultimate sense he is neither "over" it nor "before" it. But John's Logos is very God in that he was "in the beginning" and has absolute priority. John's wording was an

impossible assertion for Greek thought, where there was neither a beginning nor an end. But to the Christian mind this word implies both the primacy and the uniqueness of God as he stands at the beginning. And the fact that he stands at the beginning means that he stands also at the end and that therefore his kingdom is the goal of creation.³

All things were made by him. This statement, in the context of verse 1, is an assertion of the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, "creation from nothing." The assertion that in creation "God was not indebted to pre-existing matter" is a denial of any kind of philosophical position that would place God on balance with the universe.⁴ Also it is a denial of any position that would identify God with the universe, as in pantheism. Finally, it rules out any attempt to explain evil and imperfection in the world by positing, in Gnostic dualistic fashion, the presence of a negative, second factor in creation.⁵

On the positive side, the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* means that human existence and the existence of the world is a real, objective existence, over against God. Only in the light of this "over-againstness," this objectification of the world as creature and creation, is it possible to speak realistically of divine grace. "Creation from nothing" also emphasizes that the world is bounded by time and space, that it has a real beginning and, therefore, also a real end, and, in view of this, that history must be taken seriously.⁶

And the Word became flesh. Here John identifies the divine, creator-Word with Jesus Christ, the incarnate. Hence we must now ask as to the theological relationship between creation and the incarnation. Of this, Langdon Gilkey said: "The identity of God the Creator and God the Redeemer, of the almighty power of existence with the love of Christ, is the theological axis of the Gospel of good news."⁷ This recognition binds together the Old Testament and the New Testament and makes the story of redemption as seen in Israel's history relevant to the Gospel. The God of the Covenant people was *Yahweh sidqênû*, "The Lord our righteousness," and he it is "who was made flesh and dwelt among us," and "to all who received him . . . he gave power to become children of God" (verse 12). "This theological conjunction is perhaps the most fundamental affirmation of the Old and the New Testaments."⁸

It is precisely the recognition of this fact, throughout Christian history, that has made the doctrine of the deity of Christ so vital to a sound theology. This is why Arianism, which places Christ on a lower level than the Father, introduces a fatal imbalance into our understanding of the Old and New Testaments — the Law and the Gospel. Only the confession that Creator and Redeemer are *one* can throw the light of the Cross on the Old Testa-

ment and can grant in turn the essential perspective of the history of redemption to the act of God in Jesus Christ. Only this confession — that the Word who made all things is also the Word who gives us power to become children of God — can make possible the understanding of an old covenant and a new. Only this confession can see a union between the power of him who creates and the love of him who saves by re-creation.

Yet another important verse in the New Testament regarding creation is Hebrews 11:3: "By faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear." In this verse we are told that "*by faith* we understand" creation. Only through eyes of faith can the things of which we have spoken here be understood. As Barth said: "The insight that man owes his existence and form, together with all the reality distinct from God, to God's creation, is achieved only in the reception and answer of the divine selfwitness, that is, only in faith in Jesus Christ, i.e., in the knowledge of the unity of Creator and creature actualized in Him, and in the life in the present mediated by Him, under the right and in the experience of the goodness of the Creator towards His creature."¹⁰

Only in confrontation by God in Christ and only in commitment to him through faith does the meaning of creation come clear. Only in the experience of re-creation in Christ can we truly confess that we believe in God the Father almighty, the maker of heaven and earth. Theologically we arrive at the certainty of creation because we believe in Jesus Christ, and not vice versa. And only in this certainty that Christ is indeed the Alpha, the beginning, can we confess that he is also the end, and pray, "Even so come, Lord Jesus" (Revelation 22:20).¹¹

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* (volume two of three volumes entitled *Dogmatics*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 6.
- 2 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (volume three of four volumes, part one. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1958), p. 42.
- 3 Brunner, p. 14.
- 4 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to the Church* (volume eight of nine volumes. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Company, 1904), pp. 258-259.
- 5 Compare Isaiah 45:7; Brunner, p. 10; this concept is also the implication of the recurrent phrase in Genesis 1, "God saw that it was good."
- 6 Karl Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline* (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959), p. 55.

- 7 Langdon Gilkey, *Maker of Heaven and Earth, a Study of the Christian Doctrine of Creation* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959), p. 210.
- 8 Gilkey, loc. cit.
- 9 Gilkey, p. 211.
- 10 Barth, p. 3.
- 11 Quotations from the Bible are taken from the Revised Standard Version with the exception of the quotation from the King James Version in the closing sentence of the article.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Fridrichsen, A. J., and Others. *The Root of the Vine; Essays in Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. See chapter by Gosta Lindeskog.
- Westermann, Claus. *The Genesis Accounts of Creation*. Translated by Norman E. Wagner. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

The Occupation of University Hall

ALVIN L. KWIRAM

24

Harvard Students Eject Five Deans, Seize Building. That headline announced the beginning of the most intense flurry of propaganda, dialogue, and sloganeering that Cambridge had witnessed since the Boston Tea Party. The most striking impression which remains with me after the seemingly interminable faculty meetings of this spring is that the active participation of the moderate is crucial for effecting reasonable and essential transformation in society and for denying to the radical elements in society the exaggerated political leverage which they so often enjoy.

The action began on April 9 in the Yard, a small portion of the campus distinguished from the rest by a circumferential wrought iron fence which long ago marked the physical bounds of the University. University Hall, a rather modest gray stone building located in the geometric center of the Yard, houses the offices of the president and an assortment of deans. On the morning of April 9 seventy-some members of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) entered University Hall and emptied its contents (secretaries and deans) into the Yard, using force in those instances where argument proved ineffective. A picture showing Dean Archie C. Epps being rudely catapulted out of the building appeared in the press and on television that evening. To this point the SDS had elicited little sympathy. Not only were the large majority of the thousand or so spectators (mostly students) who descended on the Yard unsympathetic to the Hall's new occupants, but in a meeting of the SDS membership the day before, a motion to occupy a building had failed to gain a majority. A minority within SDS had decided to act despite the vote.

The stage seemed set for the demise of the SDS, which heretofore had been able to drum up little support on campus. Unfortunately, President Nathan M. Pusey was not reading the cues clearly. He and his advisers, the

deans and housemasters, were having difficulty viewing the drama with detachment. Whatever remnants of objectivity did exist seemed to vanish when these men learned that the University Hall occupants were systematically going through the files in the various offices and pilfering personal records and other potentially fascinating information. Shortly thereafter the decision was reached by this administrative group (the faculty was at no time consulted) to call in the police. The occupants were ordered to evacuate the building or be subject to legal process. They refused to move.

Four hundred strong, the police moved in at dawn on April 10 and clubbed and kicked the occupants, now numbering about two hundred, into submission. Those observers not psychologically inured to brutalization were sickened by the event. That one event transformed the mood of the University community from one of disdain for the SDS and its tactics to one of revulsion at the methods employed to rectify the situation. That event so galvanized the community that a mass meeting was called to order almost immediately in Memorial Church.

The Memorial Church meeting was tumultuous. After excited and heady debate the participants declared a three-day moratorium on classes (the SDS immediately labeled it a strike) in order to permit the entire University community to give undivided attention to a range of problems which at this stage jeopardized the very existence of the University. (There is a rumor that an ancient Massachusetts law provides for the state to take control of the University if it should ever be closed down — a novel and inexpensive technique for creating instant state universities.) Despite the atmosphere of intense emotion, the decision of the students at the Memorial Church meeting was both moderate and wise. It reflected a generous attitude, for the issues on which the SDS had focused attention had already been under consideration by the faculty, at the behest of the students, for more than a year. Deliberate stalling, obfuscation, and apathy had taken its toll of patience among students. Now in the midst of crisis the students were deliberately giving the faculty one more opportunity to play its proper role in guiding the University.

On Friday, April 11, the faculty met in a special session to deal with the crisis. There were those who strongly condemned the action of the administration, and there were those who supported it. An equally wide divergence of opinion obtained on most other questions. Nevertheless, in a surprising show of unanimity, the faculty passed a compromise motion by a large majority. The motion consisted of three parts: a condemnation of those students who participated in the occupation of University Hall, a reprimand

of the administration for bringing the police on campus, and a decision that a committee be elected by the University community to deal with some of the knottier problems. This committee of fifteen, composed of both students and faculty, was to be charged with three primary responsibilities: (1) to review the events that led up to the strike and the occupation of University Hall, (2) to determine the disciplinary action to be taken, and (3) to make a long-range study of the nature and governance of the University.

On Monday more than 10,000 members of the University community massed in Harvard Stadium to consider their response to the events of the previous four days. Such widespread interest in a single issue is unheard of in the University for anything except a Harvard-Yale football game. The surprisingly orderly meeting resulted in a decision (complimenting the faculty for its action on Friday) to suspend the "strike" for seven days to await the outcome of further actions by the faculty and administration.

The faculty began its deliberation in earnest the next day and continued in special sessions each Thursday and Tuesday thereafter for several weeks. The primary demands the faculty had to face were (1) abolition of the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), (2) nonexpansion of the University into the Cambridge housing market, and (3) establishment of a black studies program. The first two demands were the major components of the six made by the SDS. They were very well chosen, for the problems they represented were real and evident to everyone. Even the staunchest supporters of the ROTC had to admit that its role in the University is anomalous. In no other academic discipline is control of the curriculum and/or faculty appointments vested in a body outside of the University. In fact, the faculty had voted earlier in the year that this anomaly be eliminated by making ROTC an extracurricular activity, since the military seemed unwilling to give its control to the University. Unfortunately, however, the administration was decidedly uncooperative in implementing the wishes of the faculty, and this hesitation caused unpleasant confrontations between impatient students and members of the faculty who had already done what they could to deal with the ROTC issue. Ironically, a series of rather uncompromising statements on ROTC and related issues made by administrative representatives immediately preceding April 9 figured prominently in the decision of SDS members to occupy University Hall.

The nonexpansion demand (which is more complex and cannot be explained here in detail), was originally championed by the Student-Workers Alliance caucus within the SDS and is related to the high cost of housing in

Cambridge and the continuing growth of both Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (which is also located in Cambridge). Again, as in the ROTC case, a faculty committee had previously drawn up an extensive report. Entitled "The University and the City," the report made numerous recommendations regarding the role of the University in the community. These recommendations had been discussed, although with a singular lack of enthusiasm by the faculty (most of whose members do not live in Cambridge), and a preliminary report had been given tentative approval.

The issue of a black studies program emerged during the course of the turmoil, although it had not been part of the original demands made by SDS. For several years the University had grappled with the problem of introducing a black studies program that would be satisfactory to the black community on campus and not incompatible with the structures of the University. A committee, chaired by Professor Henry Rosovsky and composed of representatives of both the faculty and the ad hoc committee of black students, had been created in May 1968 to bring to the faculty a report on ways to implement such a program. In its report this committee recommended that a joint committee of students and faculty be set up to recruit black students and black faculty who in turn could establish a black studies committee that would function for a period of several years until an appropriate departmental structure could be instituted. The report had been prepared with great care, presented to the faculty, and officially approved. After the events of April 9, however, that report seemed consigned to oblivion. Not a single motion reaffirming the Rosovsky recommendations appears on the docket, although a variety of other motions proposing various unstudied solutions to the problem were submitted.

The resolution of this crucial problem was unnecessarily complicated by the actions of the president of the University, who presided over the faculty meetings. During previous meetings the faculty had operated under a suspension of the parliamentary rule that prohibits consideration of more than one motion at a time. This change was especially effective under the circumstances, for it permitted debate on several related motions to be carried on simultaneously. Now, however, the president inexplicably reinstated the rule. Requests for reconsideration of his decision were ignored.

In keeping with a prior request by the faculty, representatives of the Association of African and Afro-American Students (AAAAS) presented their views on the black studies program. One of the presentations was eloquent; one was misleading and sprinkled with a number of ominous,

thinly veiled threats. The students concluded by presenting the AAAAS demands.

Immediately a member of the faculty entered those demands as a motion. Again several members of the faculty requested that the "one-motion" rule be suspended, but the president refused to reconsider the matter. Consequently the motion affirming the demands as read became the first order of business. This presented the faculty with a delicate choice. Many members of the faculty were unhappy with some of the features of the AAAAS proposal; but if one wished to affirm one of the more moderate proposals (which, although on the docket, had not yet been officially submitted as motions), he would have to vote negatively on the first motion, aware of the recriminations that would surely result. The debate became acrimonious at times, and at one point the chairman confessed that he didn't know what was going on. Often questions from the floor were left floating in the air unanswered. Eventually, amid confusion, anger, and momentary exhaustion, the faculty voted to approve the black studies program essentially as proposed by the AAAAS.

Two features of this action are important. First, the committee to control the black studies program is to consist of equal numbers of student and faculty representatives, who are to determine both curriculum and tenure. This is a rather abrupt departure from past policy, and there is reason to believe that it is an unwise move. Already it appears that the task of finding qualified black scholars willing to commit themselves to a program over which they have negligible control is very difficult. Second, the elections for half the student representatives to the committee are to be conducted by the AAAAS itself, which is merely one of many extracurricular clubs on campus. This arrangement has already been criticized by black community members not in agreement with the association's tactics. The precedent set here is astonishing: it has been suggested that next year the Harvard Glee Club might argue, by analogy, that it be given the power to determine questions of tenure and academic policy in the music department.

There is much to recommend the idea that students be given a greater role in University affairs — not only in matters that affect them personally, but especially in evaluating the effectiveness of faculty members as teachers. This need is probably even more critical in a black studies program than it is elsewhere. Nevertheless, divisions of authority are also essential, and good judgment must establish reasonable bounds and powers in each case. In regard to the black studies program, that judgment seemed to many to be somewhat askew.

At the same time, in spite of this criticism, I would be quick to point out that harsh judgments of the faculty by those not involved may be too easy. Calm and distant deliberation yields a different perspective. One would certainly wish that more incisiveness, common sense, and objectivity had been in evidence in the faculty meetings. However, confrontation had taken place, and the faculty operated under great duress; emotions ran high, and time for reflection was minimal. Probably the response is typical of what one might expect from any such diverse group acting unprepared in a crisis. *What is clear is the high cost of postponing decisive action until the point of crisis has been reached.*

This extended account of the forces and actions surrounding the black studies issue illustrates the pressures and complexities which characterized these faculty meetings. These pressures were obviously greatly intensified by the immediate and harsh response of the administration to the occupation of University Hall. The decision to call in the police was unfortunate in the extreme. This judgment is based on pragmatic though sometimes subtle factors. Fraternization between students and police is not especially common. In Cambridge the town-gown conflict is acute, and law enforcement agents (much like the rest of society) seldom make the distinction between students and those undesirable elements that often operate in the vicinity of an urban university. The attitude of mutual disrespect is hardly conducive to cooperative action.

There is also the recurring question as to why university administrations are so anxious to yield to the demands of the militants. Yielding to their stated demands — such as abolition of the ROTC and nonexpansion of the University into the community — may be appropriate because of the “unassailable” logic of their arguments. However, the effectiveness of the SDS depends on the support of more moderate students, who can be aroused to give that support only when blood actually begins to flow; for this reason one of the most important but *unstated* demands of the militants is for police action. And that demand is rarely denied.

In retrospect one might wish that President Pusey had exercised the kind of shrewd judgment he displayed at the graduation ceremony two months later, when in the midst of hoary ritual an irreverent SDS member demanded equal time. To the subsequent dismay of all the radicals present, the president granted the request. Thereupon the student presented a three-minute oration, impromptu and illogical, which did little to advance the cause he espoused and which served to enhance greatly the image of the president. (Alternatively in April, the president might have chosen to follow the

precedent set at a sister institution some years before when those who defiantly staged a sit-in were served cookies and milk by typically affable campus guards. Such a strategy may have been impractical, but it would probably have done much less damage than the strategy actually used.)¹

No evaluation of campus disorders can be complete without a consideration of other less apparent forces that create a climate for confrontation. Among these are the profound changes that have taken place in the structure of the university itself. Twenty-five or thirty years ago the university played a less direct role in the affairs of society. But World War II and subsequent developments have produced an exponential increase in the number of students. In addition, the large infusion of federal funds for science has transformed university research into big business. More and more members of the university faculties have become involved as advisers and consultants to the government; and scholars in all areas have played an increasingly important role in determining public policy. This development has thrust the university into the mainstream of the political and economic life of the country in an entirely new way. But, as the transition from adolescence to adulthood often goes unrecognized, so this transformation has been largely ignored.

One effect of these changes has been a serious deterioration of communications among students, faculty, and administrators. In earlier times the faculty (then a small, intimate community) had handled its problems with the erudite debate characteristic of statesmen. Today, when there are much larger numbers of tenure and nontenure members, often one tentacle is ignorant of what the others are doing. In addition, the administration, which usually sees its primary responsibility as concern for orderly procedures, is often out of touch with the mood of the faculty and the mood of the students. At Harvard, the apparent attempt by the administration to sidestep the desires of the faculty on the ROTC issue enraged the students and the faculty alike and suggested an insensitivity to emerging realities.

These emerging realities are most visible, of course, in society at large. Race, war, the draft, poverty, the government's control over individual lives, the seeming irrelevance of organized religion — these are central issues. Students possessed of a large degree of idealism sense that these are the issues that are significant to their futures. Whether rightly or wrongly, they feel that the older generation has become part of the problem rather than part of the solution. Therefore, they feel, they must engage in the transformation of present society in order to prevent its self-destruction.

The idealism which in former days was directed into less violent channels — including organized religion — today seeks its own norms and forms of action. To many of us these forms are distasteful. But to the participating students there are few other means which they find effective. Peaceful protests, letters to congressmen, conventional politics, and other similar activities have had minimal influence on the major issues. Confrontations and the display of power have often initiated meaningful action. Consequently, in an atmosphere where the display of power seems to be essential for substantive change, and in an era in which most of those now seeking change have been nurtured on a steady diet of violence provided by modern mass media, the confrontations that we have seen on the campuses in the last few years do not seem quite so stark as they would earlier in another setting.

It must also be remembered that the initiation of disruptive acts on university campuses is in general the work of small groups of revolutionaries (usually less than one percent of the students), whose primary aim is the radicalization of society at large and the entire overthrow of present structures. On the other end of the spectrum are those who object to change in any form. These two groups tend to be the most militant. The large body of moderate opinion between the extremes is seldom solicited or heard. Nevertheless, the active participation of the moderates is essential to the stability of society. By abdicating its responsibility, this moderate group in fact invites the inevitable measures of repression which the actions of the usually weak radical element engender.

Fortunately, at Harvard the moderate voices were heard. (The moderate students especially made some of the most perceptive and practical suggestions.) If they had been heard earlier at Harvard and on other campuses, they might have prevented the kind of legislation being introduced across the country which may severely restrict the university in its freedom to maneuver both in its own governance and in the role it can play in shaping society. Of all institutions in a democratic society, the university certainly should play a dominant role, exercising the faculties of reason, deliberation, and study to protect (not preserve) our traditions and renew our institutions through continual search for understanding. The universities themselves need to change. New policies need to be instituted, new procedures established. The governance of universities must be reviewed. But all of these things should be done judiciously, with all segments of the university contributing their reasoned positions. Ideally one might wish that *before* the events of early April the administration and the faculty both had given more serious attention to the issues that were being martialled for con-

frontation. More decisive and flexible action at an earlier stage could have initiated reasonable and progressive change; now the failure to gauge the sense of the sixties has forced the University to submit to unreasonable change. These are lessons that history has taught before, and one might hope that at least the academic community would have been more alert to the possibility of such developments. But that community is so involved with the daily routine of administration and scholarship that atypical matters of justice and equity are often ignored. Unfortunately this event, and others on the campuses and in the cities throughout the nation, will probably not suffice to bring our society to the point of dealing seriously with crucial issues while there is still relative tranquility.

Campus confrontation has become distressingly routine. It can almost be characterized as the dramatic production of a touring company engaged in producing living theater. The drama might be entitled "How To Be Trying Without Really Being a Revolutionary." It will be performed again. The one at Harvard was acted out on a small stage. It may be worthwhile for us to study the plot, for it contains within it many of the elements of a larger drama in which all of us must participate.

¹ Two quite accurate accounts of the April event at Harvard can be found in the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* 71, 11 (April 28, 1969) and in the *Report of The Committee of Fifteen* (June 9, 1969).

On Being a Seven-day Scientist: Thoughts on the Scientific Attitude

DONALD E. HALL

33

They called themselves Seven-day Adventists, the returned missionary said. And they could be forgiven for a minor grammatical slip in the foreign tongue. It really wasn't a bad idea anyhow, he pointed out, since their religion was not put on for the seventh day alone but furnished them with an attitude that was useful and used — all week long.

Although it may seem obvious what parallel the title of this article suggests, we are dealing here with at least one word that means different things to different people. It's an interesting experience to go around wearing this label *scientist*, or more particularly *physicist*. When others first see it, their reactions often lie somewhere between "Ohhhhhh . . . I could *never* understand that" and "But what on *earth* do you *do*?" (That latter question seems even funnier to an *astro*-physicist.)

How interesting to have both labels — Scientist and Seventh-day Adventist. The combination is at least enigmatic, and there are a few who consider it downright inconsistent: the Seventh-day Adventist Scientist. Does the average person know many of these odd creatures? Does he have the impression that it is difficult or risky for an Adventist to go into science? that it is unusual for a person who is already a scientist to develop an interest in Adventism? or that "outside" scientists would wonder how one could possibly be religious and at the same time a worthy colleague?

These questions are potentially valid and interesting. But I wish to focus here on the other side of the coin. Is there a sense in which the scientist who publicly bears the label is only a representative of a larger class who deserve it equally? We could readily admit into that class all genuine scholars in all fields of intellectual endeavor. Perhaps before we finish we can invite in even those who make no pretext of scholarly professions.

If I may go beyond what I find in my dictionary, I would like to suggest several levels of meaning for the word *science* and distinguish among them. First, we may speak of one of the intellectual disciplines mainly as an organized body of specialized knowledge. This is usually what we mean when we refer to one particular field, like biochemistry, as well as when we use the general terms "humanities, arts, and sciences." Let us call this ¹Science *Science as Knowledge*. This science corresponds to the picture most common in the layman's mind. In fact, when we are earning a living from day to day, most of us who bear the label tend to be just working as a ¹Scientist, the same way someone else is a carpenter or a musician.

But from a professional point of view, ¹Science only provides a base on which one hopes to build some ²Science. The latter is more important, and correspondingly harder. I spend at least a little time each work day aiming (I hope) for ²Science; but if I actually achieve one little piece of it in a week and one medium-large chunk in a year, I will probably keep up my satisfaction — and my reputation. For by ²Science I mean *Science as Art*. The advancement of ¹Science — the addition of significant new understanding — depends on imagination, originality, creativity, not just familiarity with established ideas and not just ability to manipulate them, but the *generation* of completely new thought. Ideally this concern with being not only a ¹Scientist but also a ²Scientist will lead me to be a ³Scientist as well.

Knowledge will be best advanced by Art when that in turn is based on proper Attitude. At first it may seem literary license to propose ³Science, *Science as Attitude*. I would argue, however, that we are misled if we think we can present the essence of the subject objectively by some list of steps in the "scientific method," such as Awareness, Observation, Induction, Hypothesis, Deduction, and Verification, for if this list is taken only as a recipe, the point has been missed. The significant problems are exactly those not yet listed in the cookbook, and our outline is only an attempt to picture what most often results from an attitude. Inquisitiveness, dissatisfaction with what may be deemed adequate understanding by others, willingness to search out all evidence and view it according to its merits, conscious effort to eliminate prejudice, careful allowance for other possibilities not yet thought of — these will lead us to ³Science.

The ¹Scientist must bear a special burden of responsibility in setting ³Science before the layman, for he is continually using working hypotheses. For example, there are significant questions about Einstein's theory of relativity that have not yet been settled. But there would be great logistical

difficulty in beginning one's work anew every day from first principles. So, having at one time thought at length on the subject and being perfectly willing to give it further critical examination whenever that is appropriate, the ¹Scientist will take relativity as a working hypothesis for the day and try to find within that framework what *will* be the answer to the small immediate problem at hand *if* (as he thinks reasonably likely) the hypothesis is really correct. The danger is that this tool of the trade will be used so automatically that it appears as dogmatism to the layman. The ¹Scientist must constantly reexamine his own mind to be sure that the openness is still there and must take pains to make his attitude clear to others.

It may still seem that this attitude is just a description of my six-day work week. But I am proposing that ³Science is the kind that has most to offer to religion. For while the layman may tend to think of Belief in a vague and mystical way, Belief is not something that just happens — and happens in such a way that the person speaking fortuitously ends up with the correct version, the Last Word. The training of the ³Scientist (and ideally of the philosopher or any other well-educated person) makes him keenly aware that all belief is based on evidence of one kind or another — it may be strong or weak, good or bad, direct or indirect, properly or improperly used, but evidence nonetheless.

To go even further, those things we customarily refer to as Facts are also dependent on evidence — from the senses, or from authority, or from logical deduction from premises. They can be assigned only relative "certainties," depending on the quality and quantity of evidence. The point can be made clear by an extreme example: I feel quite confident, emotionally, that there exists a typewriter with which I am now writing. In fact, if someone denied it, my instinctive reaction would be "Are you out of your mind?" Yet at a different level I realize that I can "know" (or believe) this "fact" only (*a*) insofar as the signals from my eyes and hands and ears are reliable and are being correctly processed in the brain, (*b*) insofar as my dictionary is correct in telling me the correspondence between word and object, and (*c*) insofar as it is correct to think that I myself have a rational existence.

Even to the ¹Scientist it is important to recognize that all his interpretations of nature are really models. The careful ¹Scientist will not make categorical statements insisting that his description of a natural phenomenon cannot possibly be wrong in any way; he will only assign a relative value to his model on the basis of its usefulness in making sense of the evidence. And if he should use the phrase "I believe that — " his intended meaning will be "I assign a fairly high probability to the correctness of this explanation" or

"I have found it helpful in achieving a coherent relation among several pieces of evidence."

Now it may be a distinctly unpleasant transition for a person from a conservative religious background that places a high premium on "faith" to adopt this critical attitude toward religious ideas. Yet I consider it desirable. Are not bald statements of belief (in God, in the Bible, or whatever you will) practically meaningless apart from the evidence that prompts them? The evidence is there, without exception; the only question is its strength. If the evidence is good, it will stand; if it is bad, we would do well to renew the search. But I cannot rationally assign *certainly* to any model of reality (be it the natural or the supernatural aspect of reality) as long as there is (or may come to be) contradictory evidence. I may assign a very high probability to a model which says God exists, yet even for the sake of "faith" I cannot claim that the evidence is entirely on one side, or that I am an infallible interpreter of that evidence.

Then what is the value of faith? It does not increase our knowledge; on the contrary it is precisely what encourages us to proceed and act even though our knowledge is *not* complete. What value do we assign to the ability to make positive, categorical statements of belief? Sometimes I have thought it a good thing to have some people around who could do that, to balance my view. Then again I have thought we would profit if others would join the ³Scientist in making this semantic distinction. Am I advocating an irreversible path which will mean a loss of innocence for those who travel it? Yes, probably, and I agree that this has its sad aspects. But so also does the growth of our children. The road to maturity must be traveled.

I recall a perennial sequence in "Peanuts" in which Charlie Brown is persuaded, in a different way each year, to believe that Lucy is going to hold a football for him to kick. He invariably lands on his head when she jerks the football away. If we pick a particular doctrine and say, "Here we must ignore some contrary evidence, exercise our faith, and boldly state our unhesitating belief," is there not a parallel? It may be argued that some questions are so fundamental, so important, that this must be done. But should that not mean instead that it is all the more important to be careful and accurate? Rushing forward time after time, with great assurance, when the football just might not be there after all, may be cute for Charlie Brown, but it is unbecoming to the supposedly mature Christian.

Should not Science as Attitude — desire to get to the root of things, to view all evidence without prejudice, to allow alternative explanations, to be

willing to admit uncertainty — become the property of the layman just as much as of the professional scholar? And could it not be a useful, and used, attitude on all seven days of the week?

37



Sheaf . . . DIRK KOOPMANS

SUMMER 1969

willing to admit uncertainty — become the property of the layman just as much as of the professional scholar? And could it not be a useful, and used, attitude on all seven days of the week?

37



Sheaf . . . DIRK KOOPMANS

SUMMER 1969

Götterdämmerung

... a blearing light
bewails the Son-visited earth
 parched tongues of dust
 lap up
 blood in trans-
 fixed hands

putrid flesh,
 pendant on bones
cover-blown by
yesterday newspapers, lies
 buried on the sidewalk
(headlines telling a better world
 to come:

It came & went)

childrens laughter
 echoing faint
 thru garbage-rimmed alleys
mocks their silent graves

october leaves rot
 in empty eyesockets
which no longer must look
 into the Sun

but worry not, o son of man,
yours is the earth
 and everything thats in it
so sleep now your millennial dream —
 in the twilight of your nightmares ...

Gregory R. Wise

Operation Dare

VICTOR A. HERVIG

39

The thesis of this article is that unless a better solution can be found for the problem of spiraling tuition costs that now force too many Adventist students to attend non-Adventist colleges and that threaten to price Adventist higher education out of business, the 1970 General Conference session must originate powerful central planning and rechannel part or all of the union conference educational funds to the North American Division Commission on Higher Education.

The problem arises because of the absence of central planning. Each Adventist college or university, striving to be everything to everybody, develops a growth pattern that is too often based on local pride and that too often includes unnecessary tuition-raising and quality-lowering duplications in certain specialized areas. Unfortunately, while the increasingly knotty fiscal problems associated with Adventist higher education have produced widespread discussion about federal aid, far less emphasis has been given to the pertinent issue of central planning.

Business administrators, academic deans, and others have long advocated central planning; yet few fully realize its immense economic advantages. In "Whither Adventist Higher Education?" in the Winter 1969 SPECTRUM, Charles B. Hirsch discussed the problem and the needed change in general terms, but stopped short of offering specific and feasible proposals for introducing that change. One such proposal is attempted here.

Adventist colleges and universities in North America receive \$11 million annually from the church — roughly the equivalent of a \$200 million endowment fund.¹ Most of this subsidy comes from the eight union conferences, each supporting the institution(s) within its area, with relatively little interference from other union conferences or control by the General Conference. In short, the union conferences are practically autonomous, so

that within the North American Division, the church operates eight separate subsidy programs to support thirteen colleges and universities. The existing North American Division Commission on Higher Education has virtually no power to enforce its recommendations for coordination and efficiency; it operates like a squad of handcuffed policemen.

During the 1960's, the increase in tuition rates at Adventist colleges was approximately nine times as fast as the consumer-price index. This trend threatens a financial crisis that will turn many students to public institutions and that will become worse than ever if tuition rates are increased still further.² At this point Adventist institutions must either accept additional kinds of federal aid (thus possibly jeopardizing their status as religious institutions) or submit to serious and sound central planning while the situation is still reparable. The world waits for a smog disaster before doing something serious about smog. Must Adventists do likewise in regard to the tuition spiral?

The proposal offered here, though not new, is drastic enough to justify the name OPERATION DARE. The time and place to begin a system of sound central curriculum planning — with “teeth” — is the summer of 1970 at the General Conference session in Atlantic City, New Jersey. With the authority to apportion a significant percentage or all of the church's funds for higher education, the North American Division Commission would have the necessary bargaining power. The Commission, of course, should properly represent all the institutions involved, with a minimum of power in the hands of any individual. The financial structure of Adventist higher education in North America would then resemble that of the University of California, which in many ways makes much more financial sense than the present collection of practically autonomous Adventist units.

For example, while a variety of subjects is taught at most University of California campuses, the vice president for planning and development, working together with the campus architects, allows only the Davis and Riverside campuses to strive for world preeminence in agriculture; there is no fight to build, staff, and maintain many agricultural programs with a budget that can afford only a couple of superb ones. If, on the other hand, UC's central planning were as minimal as that among Adventist colleges, many local campus administrators would no doubt soon start pointing with pride to their own progress in agriculture — while in reality the thinning out of the university's resources was sending the overall quality of agricultural education and research into a nosedive.

If with all its wealth the University of California needs central planning,

certainly Adventist higher education needs it. Even if all opposition to federal aid to Adventist colleges were removed, the financial squeeze would by no means be ended, and some form of central planning would still be desirable.

It is hardly to be expected that any of the Adventist colleges and universities will voluntarily institute the reforms envisioned in connection with central planning. Only a program enforced by financial considerations could be effective. No amount of urging or persuasion can overcome the basic motivations of individual colleges — motivations that may sometimes be couched in financial terms but that in reality are typically based on a drive for status. Each institution is busy trying to keep up with all the others; therefore each one is trying to expand in all directions. If College X adopts a new program, do the others each say, “It will be most economical to let X carry this program alone, since splitting two or more ways would make both operations a financial loss”? Not likely. The usual response is, “If X can do it, we can do it. We must not fall behind. We must do everything X does, even if we all lose money doing it.” If the appropriate question were asked, “Would this new program do better at College X or Y or Z?” it is unlikely that any of the colleges would agree; only a central planning commission could properly answer that question.

On the surface, it may seem totally undesirable to have restrictions forced on various institutions; but to reduce the capacity of the colleges to hurt themselves, central planning with enforcement power is called for — as the following examples illustrate.

EXAMPLE ONE. A new pipe organ was recently acquired and installed on the La Sierra campus of Loma Linda University at a cost exceeding \$100,000. Certain other colleges also have expensive organs. Must *every* Adventist college duplicate this kind of facility? All colleges need reasonably strong music departments, but very few students need a \$100,000 organ. Money might be saved and an even better educational program might be achieved by sending the most promising organ students to one or two campuses especially equipped to serve them. But the practice of sprinkling \$100,000 bundles of tuition and subsidy funds here, there, and everywhere for small groups of students is well established and difficult to change. A lack of strong central planning in the past is to blame. Yet many stories of unnecessary duplication still belong to the future if Adventist higher education continues its present course.

EXAMPLE TWO. Industrial education is typically a small program in any single college, and it is an expensive one because of the equipment required

and the time involved in supervising long laboratory periods. We scatter our resources by building medium- or low-quality trade schools in the form of additional courses and programs with no concerted objective. Some classes are so small that there is no healthy competition. Heavy equipment for wood and metal work and automechanics is found on campuses only a few hundred miles apart. Central planning could probably create one or two excellent trade schools of concentrated technical training. If established on existing college campuses, these trade schools would provide their students the many advantages of an Adventist educational environment without duplicating the nontechnical programs. A few courses in vocational skills could meet the applied arts requirements of students at the other colleges.

EXAMPLE THREE. For many years Walla Walla College has offered a program in engineering — a most expensive endeavor even for those institutions whose spending capacity dwarfs that of Adventist colleges. Instead of attempting to inaugurate another engineering program elsewhere at a time when traveling distance is becoming less important, the church might achieve maximum quality at minimum cost to all by encouraging Adventist engineering students to go to Walla Walla College and subsidizing their travel expenses. If an unbiased study by a central planning commission revealed such an arrangement to be not merely feasible but definitely advantageous, the commission should have the power to withhold funds from any college that insisted on duplicating expensive facilities.

EXAMPLE FOUR. Graduate programs have many hidden and undesirable consequences. In cost, for example, the normal ratio of lower-division, upper division, and graduate education is approximately 1 to 3 to 8, and in small colleges the relative cost of graduate studies may be even greater because of even smaller classes.³ Yet there is constant pressure for more graduate courses: participating departments generally want to do more, and those not participating often become jealous and want to get started.

The fragmented expansion of graduate programs with little overall central planning at many Adventist institutions is bleeding the undergraduate students in two ways: financially, through increased tuition rates required by the small sizes of graduate classes; and, in some cases, qualitatively, when teachers spend disproportionately more time on their graduate courses than on their undergraduate courses. Even so, the graduate programs generally remain relatively weak in terms of facilities and equipment when compared with programs in larger private and public institutions. In the past, certain Adventist colleges have ended some years with six-figure op-

erating deficits caused in part by graduate programs. Accrediting bodies have on occasion criticized some of these institutions for attempting to run graduate programs without adequate resources. And our central planning is still practically nil.

IN SUMMARY: central planning is not only a means of using dollars more effectively but also a way to better education. It may be the only road to survival. But its initiation obviously depends on the willingness of the union conferences — and in particular on their presidents, with their considerable influence — to allocate educational funds to the central agency. This change will not happen without constructive dialogue and widespread support for the concept of effective central planning in Adventist higher education.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 Charles B. Hirsch, Relevant Teaching for Revolutionary Times, *Review and Herald* 145, 4 (November 21, 1968).
- 2 United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, *The Consumer Price Index* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office). Issued annually. Also, individual bulletins of Seventh-day Adventist colleges.
- 3 Dexter M. Keezer (ed.), *Financing Higher Education, 1960-70; the McGraw-Hill Book Company 50th Anniversary Study of the Economics of Higher Education in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 97.

Tuition Rates in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges

WILFRED M. HILLOCK

44

Tuition charges in Adventist colleges have spiraled upward from an average of \$550 in 1958-59 to \$1,300 in 1968-69¹ — an increase of 136 percent at a time when the American economy experienced an inflation of 20 percent² and when tuition and fees in other private colleges rose an average of 104 percent.³

A tuition increase faster than the inflation rate is understandable, because teacher salaries, a major component of tuition costs, were outdistancing the consumer-price index. For example, a measurement of teacher-salary increases on the La Sierra campus of Loma Linda University on the basis of salary records for several selected teachers indicates an average increase of 75 percent from 1958 to 1968. Yet at the close of the ten-year period, salaries in Adventist colleges were still several thousand dollars per year below the average of \$12,700 in other private colleges, while Adventist tuition rates have come close to the private college average of \$1,327 per year.⁴

As the tuition rates of Adventist colleges approach those of other private institutions, and as the dollar amount becomes larger in relation to tuition costs in public colleges (where the 1968-69 average in institutions with 1,000 to 2,500 students was \$273), more attention must be directed to measures that can halt or reverse this upward trend.

A simplified formula for calculating the tuition rate is as follows: teacher-related expense (salaries, fringe benefits, student assistants, supplies, advanced study, conventions, library operation) plus other expense (maintenance of the physical plant, administration, depreciation, student aid) minus income other than tuition (church subsidies, investment income, operating gains of college industries and residence halls). The balance is the amount the students must pay if the school is to remain in operation. The

tuition rate per student is determined by dividing the total necessary tuition income by the full-time equivalent number of students (partial student loads being calculated fractionally).

Let us consider Hypothetical Adventist College, which offers forty different majors and a total of 2,400 semester hours of courses. Its total teacher-related and other expense (after the agonizing budgetary process of eliminating all but essential items) is \$2,600,000; its expected nontuition income is \$500,000; and \$2,100,000 remains to be paid by tuition. An estimate based on the previous year's enrollment indicates that the number of full-time equivalent students will be 1,500; so the tuition per full-time student is \$1,400.

If it is not possible to raise the tuition to \$1,400 in order to bring the budget into balance, then further deletions must be made from academic programs. This, in fact, is quite often what occurs, and we can expect it to happen more and more frequently.

Expansion of the curriculum has become an accepted way of life on the Adventist college campus. This growth has been financed by increasing tuition rates and by increasing enrollment each year. But to assume that these factors will continue to operate during the next ten years to the extent that they have in the past ten years is not reasonable.

Many persons have already come to the conclusion that, in the future, tuition-rate growth must be limited to the rate of general economic inflation as measured by indicators such as the consumer-price index. Increases at a faster rate will be self-defeating if they force Adventist students to attend public colleges, for any reduction in enrollment will reduce tuition income and thus only defeat the purpose of raising the tuition.

A significant factor in a projection of future enrollment trends is the number of students who are of college age within the general population. This number is predictable, since these are the children who were born eighteen years before. In the past decade we have experienced a growth of 50 percent in the size of the freshman-age population: in 1959 there were 2,500,000 in the eighteen-year-old bracket; by 1969 this group has increased to 3,750,000. In the next ten years we can look forward to a growth of 15 percent during the first half of the period and stabilization in the latter half, with a reduced population of eighteen-year-olds after 1979.⁵

Another factor that has affected college enrollment in the past is the increasing proportion of college-age young people actually attending college. Between 1900 and 1940 this figure rose from 4 percent of the population to 16 percent, and by 1960 it had risen to 40 percent. But the rate of

increase has now slowed considerably, and the present figure is 44 percent.⁶ It appears that we cannot expect any substantial increase in the proportion of the college-age population actually attending college in future years.

The recent pattern of enrollment growth in Adventist colleges is a curve parallel to that of the growth of the eighteen-year-old population, the magnitude of enrollment growth being roughly equal to the 50 percent growth in the freshman-age group. The baby boom of the postwar years is past, and its surging effect on college enrollment is no longer working in our favor. Smaller families mean fewer students in college and increased competition for those eligible for college. The end of the Vietnam war would bring a temporary surge in enrollment; although temporary, this might give some time to solve the underlying financial problems.

On the basis of the trends noted above, we can expect a gradual increase in college enrollments for a period of about five years, followed by a leveling-off period and then a decline. This would not be so serious a matter for Adventist higher education except for the declining percentage of students who will attend private colleges. One prediction is that we can expect the current level of 30 percent to drop to 20 percent by 1980. The current student unrest on large university campuses may be an unforeseen factor working in favor of private liberal arts colleges, however.

If church membership were growing rapidly, this would provide Adventist colleges with an additional source of college students. Using the growth rate of recent years as an indicator, however, we can expect church membership in North America to grow by approximately 3 percent per year.⁷ Unless this rate increases significantly, there are no large increases in enrollment here to allow continued college expansion.

In view of the fact that we may have reached a ceiling on tuition rates and may now face the prospect of leveling or declining enrollments, continued growth of tuition income to Adventist colleges is highly unlikely. We must consider the possibility of having to maintain the status quo or even of submitting to a forced retrenchment. This has already become a reality on some Adventist campuses.

There are some benefits that may accrue from this situation, since Adventist colleges will have to examine present policies to see if traditional practices can be improved. In the past we have assumed that improvement is a matter of adding courses and majors. Self-examination may now reveal other avenues of progress toward academic excellence.

In the example of Hypothetical Adventist College we divided the total budgeted academic expense into two classifications, teacher-related expense

and other expense. In the actual Adventist college we find that teacher-related expense represents 55 percent of the total and other costs 45 percent. An informal analysis of the member colleges of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities discloses that its corresponding figures are just reversed: in other private colleges in the same enrollment range as the majority of Adventist colleges, teacher-related expense represents 45 percent of the total academic expense budgeted and other costs 55 percent. We can conclude that teacher-related costs might be a productive area of study.

What is it that determines total teacher-related costs? Obviously the level of salaries is a major factor; but in Adventist colleges this can hardly explain the unusually high teacher-related expense, since Adventist teacher salaries plus fringe benefits are lower than in other private institutions. The situation, in fact, leaves us with an even wider gap to explain. Are Adventist teachers wasteful of supplies? is the library budget extravagant? do conventions take a larger-than-normal amount of funds? Not likely, nor is any one of these items large enough to explain the magnitude of difference that exists.

One factor that would cause higher teacher-related costs is the Adventist practice of financing advanced education; few other colleges do as much in assisting teachers to obtain terminal degrees. But this additional expense is more than offset by lower salary levels — especially in the case of teachers who have already received terminal degrees and have excelled in their profession, since the salary differential between Adventist and other colleges is greater in higher academic ranks.

The teaching load is also significant here: large loads mean that fewer teachers are needed to teach the same number of courses. But whereas twelve to fourteen hours per semester is normal for teachers in Adventist colleges, the usual loads are lower in other private colleges. Again the gap to be explained is widened.

The number of courses and majors offered by a college may have a bearing on the problem of unusually high teacher-related costs. Much has been written about "course proliferation," and it may have become an unpopular subject with teachers. From the individual department viewpoint, there is very little incentive to examine its programs and course offerings for possible eliminations; for the department that reduces its offerings is likely to lose out in the fight for more funds and more teachers.

But if the faculty is not willing to address itself to this problem, then the trustees will be forced by economic considerations to take over the determi-

- 6 Dexter M. Keezer (ed.), *Financing Higher Education, 1960-70; the McGraw-Hill Book Company 50th Anniversary Study of the Economics of Higher Education in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 57.
- 7 Beardsley Ruml, *Memo to a College Trustee: A Report on Financial and Structural Problems of the Liberal Arts College*; part 4, *Achievement of the Possible* by Donald H. Morrison; prepared and transmitted by the Fund for the Advancement of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 13.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Earl J. McGrath, *Memo to a College Faculty Member* (New York: Columbia University Teacher's College, Institution of Higher Education Publication, 1961).

The Puritans and the Sabbath

M. JERRY DAVIS

51

The Puritans devoted a great deal of attention to the subject of the Sabbath. The observance of the Sabbath on the Christian day with the Jewish prohibitions may well be the unique theological contribution of the English to the Continental Reformation. Neither Luther nor Calvin felt strongly about the sacredness of the day. Both considered it sufficient to hear the service in the morning and then devote the remainder of the day to whatever activity seemed either prudent or appropriate, whether it was recreation or productive labor. England, however, faced a problem different from that of the Continent. Sundays and holy days had taken on the character of licentious, drunken orgies. Over one hundred days in every year had been set aside for the celebration of some festival. As a result, little attention was given to the hearing of services and to other efforts for the general improvement of the populace.

The source of Puritan concern is evident from the attitude with which the Bible was embraced. Two commandments in particular were being disregarded, according to the Puritans. The concern over idolatry had been largely dissipated by the defeat in 1588 of the Spanish Armada and the consequent diminishment of Roman Catholic influence. The dispute over the proper observance of the Sabbath was not to be settled so easily.

The spark that ignited the Sabbatarianism was struck on Sunday, January 13, 1583, when a scaffold holding observers at a bear-baiting pit toppled over and killed eight people. John Field, a Puritan minister, rose to the occasion and produced a tract entitled *A Godly exhortation by occasion of the Late Judgement of God Shewed at Parris Garden*. The scaffold being old, rotten, and overloaded, he granted that no real miracle of destruction could be claimed; but the fact that no piece or post was left standing upright seemed to him an indication of divine intervention.

Two years later, Parliament passed a law for stricter observance of the Sabbath. Queen Elizabeth quickly vetoed the bill, in harmony with her policy to alter nothing in the ecclesiastical government.¹

Lancelot Andrews put forth almost all of the Puritan arguments to be advanced in favor of Sabbath observance in the seventeenth century in several manuscripts prepared in the last decade of the sixteenth century. He asserted that the injunction to observe the Sabbath was a moral one. He suggested that the day was altered at the time of the apostles to commemorate such events as the resurrection and the pentecost and to indicate that the Jewish dispensation had terminated.²

Andrews' works were not published until after his death, but his ideas were circulated in manuscript form. Richard Greenham incorporated most of Andrews' ideas in his work entitled *A Treatise on the Sabbath*.

A statement indicating the attitude of both Andrews and Greenham on the proper observance of the Sabbath is offered in the following paragraph: "For seeing the Sabbath day is the school day, the fair day, the market day, the feeding day of the soul, when men purely knowing the use of it, separate it wholly from other days, they shall see, how they may recover themselves from sins already past, arm themselves against sin to come, grow in knowledge, increase in faith, and how much they shall be strengthened in the inner man."³

Nicolas Bownd, Greenham's son-in-law, took the next step and put the arguments into book form, *The True Doctrine of the Sabbath*, which appeared in 1595. It was one of the most remarkable books ever written. Only a few works have enjoyed greater influence. Bownd believed in the necessity of a radical transformation of English morality. He presented the ideas that the profanation of the day of rest tended toward the degradation of all of life and that society's only hope was to restore the day of rest to its intended sanctity. Bownd sought to elevate the Sabbath and at the same time to declare the utter impotence of the crown or the church to make any other day holy. This claim drew the opposition of Queen Elizabeth and Archbishop John Whitgift. Orders were issued in 1599 and 1600 for all persons in possession of the book to give it up. Repressive efforts proved vain, and another issue was published after Whitgift's death. Henceforth, the rigid observance of the Sabbath was a distinguishing mark of the Puritan.

The importance of the Puritan contribution on the Sabbath to later religious movements is well stated by Lyman Coleman:

The divine authority of the Sabbath, was neither recognized by the ancient Fathers, nor by Luther or Calvin, nor by the early Reformers. It was reserved for the Puritans,

to their immortal honor, first to expound and enforce the law of the Christian Sabbath, based on the authority of God's word. They better read the law of the Lord our God on this subject, and bringing it out from the enormous mass of saint's days and festivals with which the church had overlaid it, like some priceless gem disinterred from the rubbish of many generations, presented it to the gaze and adoration of the world, radiant with heaven's own lustre. The influence of the sun in the heavens is not more clear or genial than is that of the Christian Sabbath, holy unto the Lord, by God's command. With all else throughout Christendom the Sabbath is a holiday, a festival observed by common consent like other saint's days and festivals of the calendar.⁴

By 1617, the influence of Puritanism reached a level that threatened to restrict the activities of the general population on Sunday afternoons. To stem the tide of restriction, James I published a declaration authorizing legal recreations on the Sabbath. It was entitled, *The King Majesties Declaration to His Subjects concerning lawful Sports to be used*. He pointed out three practical reasons for allowing simple recreations. James believed, first, that the cessation of simple pleasures would expose the church to the attack of the recusants, who would then have occasion to say that the church was opposed to the pleasure and happiness of the people. Second, if the people were denied the exercise of vigorous recreation, they might become unfit for fighting if a war should break out. Third, without recreation to occupy the hours following divine services, many would be tempted to tippling and drunkenness.

The Laudian Bishop, William Pierce, added a fourth objection: If men had no sports to occupy them on Sundays, they might meet for illegal religious discussion. Pierce was noted for "putting down" sermons because they hindered the sale of church ales — the riotous jollifications at which money was raised for parish funds.

As an opponent of Puritanism, James I was always anxious to respond to public feeling when it ran counter to Puritan belief. His declaration stated: "No lawful recreation shall be barred to Our good people, which shall not tend to the breach of Our aforesaid laws, and canons of our church."⁵ He gave his approval to dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, May games and May poles, and the judicious use of ale. Bull-baiting and bear-baiting were frowned upon, and bowling was a pleasure denied to the meaner sort of persons.

John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim congregation, had a high regard for the day of rest. He believed that the day was set aside by God in the Decalogue for the purpose of edification and spiritual enlightenment, that the godly should take time for worship and reflection, and that the divinely appointed time for religious devotions was the Sabbath.

Robinson presented his discussion of the Sabbath question in his work *A Just and Necessary Apology*, published in 1625, the year of his death. He recognized that the day celebrated as the Sabbath by the Christian world was not the Sabbath to which the fourth commandment of the Decalogue referred. He believed that the change from Saturday to Sunday was merely circumstantial. Further, he suggested that Christ himself had taught the Disciples all things necessary for salvation and that they had met for worship on the first day of the week. He recalled a number of biblical references to occasions of Sunday worship or gathering by the early Christian Church.⁶

The Puritans believed that the sanctification of the Sabbath should involve several aspects of the Christian's behavior and concern. The people were to rest from their toils and labors. They were to recall God's benevolences in the past. They were to grow in piety toward God and charity toward men. They were to refrain from meddling with the babble of men who gave no concern to spiritual values.

The Puritans recognized that there was nothing particularly sacred about a specific day, but that the sacredness was determined by that to which the day was devoted. They believed that the more frequently a man heard the word of God, the more affection he would have for it, just as hunger for the word diminishes among those who hear it infrequently.

The Puritans saw in the efforts of every society to establish a holy day an indication that the Spirit of God was at work everywhere. They did not believe that the Sabbath was a matter of private interpretation, to be settled by individual conscience, but rather that the sacredness of the Sabbath was a matter of divine planning. They desired to live in harmony with that plan. The influence of their thought is apparent today in the tenets of every major American religious institution. The Puritans would note with no small regret the gulf between profession and practice that characterizes the modern American church.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 JOHN STRYPE, *Annals of the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824) Book One, chapter 24, pp. 426-432. Strype gives Serjeant John Puckering's speech "For the Better and more Reverend observing of the Sabbath-day." This speech marks the first time Sunday is referred to as the Sabbath in Parliament.
- 2 LANCELOT ANDREWS, *A Patterne of Catechisticall Doctrine* (London: 1630).
- 3 RICHARD GREENHAM, *A Treatise on the Sabbath, The Works of Richard Greenham* (London: Felix Kingston, 1959), p. 290.
- 4 LYMAN COLEMAN, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the Life of the Primitive*

Christians (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1852), p. 132. Quoted by ROBERT COX, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question* (Edinburgh: MacLachlan and Stewart; and Simpkin, Marshall and Company, 1865). This massive two-volume work is the most extensive bibliographical reference available on the subject of the Sabbath.

- 5 JAMES I. *The King Majesties Declaration to his Subjects Concerning Lawful Sports to Be Used* (London: Bonham Norton, 1618), p. 5.
- 6 *John* 20:19, 26: Jesus was raised on the first day of the week. *Acts* 20:6, 7: Paul held a meeting on the first day of the week; *2 Corinthians* 16:1, 2: the offerings were gathered on the first day of the week.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

BOWND, NICOLAS. *The True Doctrine of the Sabbath*. London: F. J. Porter, 1959.

BROOK, BENJAMIN. *Lives of the Puritans*. London: 1813.

CAMPBELL, DOUGLAS. *The Puritan in Holland, England and America*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1893.

COX, ROBERT. *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*. Edinburgh: MacLachlan and Stewart; and Simpkin, Marshall and Company, 1865.

FIELD, JOHN. *A Godly Exhortation by Occasion of the Late Judgement of God Shewed at Parris Garden*. London: 1853.

HILL, CHRISTOPHER. *The Century of the Revolution*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.

KNAPPEN, M. M. *Tudor Puritanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

ROBINSON, JOHN. *The Works of John Robinson*. Three volumes. John Snow, 1851.

The Peaceable Kingdom

KEN MACKINTOSH



REVIEWS

The Mennonites and Social Responsibility

CHARLES W. TEEL, JR.

MENNONITE GENERAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS (1967)
Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, 1967 166 pp

57

To begin by way of understatement: The published minutes of a denominational general conference session are not normally written in such a manner as to hold the lay reader spellbound. The *Mennonite General Conference Proceedings (1967)* are no exception, for the delegate lists, membership statistics, and financial columns hold little more appeal than does a newly released edition of Webster's dictionary. Yet as one works past budgets and tables to committee reports and resolutions, this Mennonite document allows the reader to participate in much of the excitement and frustration encountered as an extremely conservative and almost altogether rural Protestant group attempts to redefine its relation to "the world."

In this process of redefinition the Mennonite delegates wrestle with the following questions: In what ways is the church, an institution that fosters an eschatological hope, required to exercise a social responsibility in the present order? To what extent is the Christian responsible for the corporate life of the world, and how should this responsibility be expressed in concrete social action? When the individual Christian experiences salvation and reconciliation, are the demands of the gospel such as to call him to witness through social structures and thus to interpret salvation and reconciliation in social as well as personal terms?

The minutes indicate that once these classic questions are probed, delegates are then brought face to face with such specific issues as war and peace, civil rights, economic exploitation, slums, expanding populations, capital punishment, riots, the problem of divided Protestantism, and related social problems.

The fact that these topics are discussed by the Mennonites is especially significant when one realizes that this group has traditionally practiced a highly individualistic ethic, with rigid separatist tendencies that have produced strong negative attitudes toward outgroups. The following excerpts from local conference *Disciplines* of the (Old) Mennonite Church, all of which were issued as recently as the 1940's, illustrate these characteristics.

We deem it inadvisable for any of our members to commune with such who do not uphold the whole gospel.¹

We recommend that our brethren do not move into near-by districts unless about half a dozen families or more move together.²

It is advisable for our members to refrain from all political and civil offices.³

Members . . . shall not take part in electioneering or political demonstrations.⁴

Patronizing or taking part in fairs, movies, theatres, regularly organized contesting ball teams, dancing, carnal shows, and such like are not permitted.⁵

Brothers or sisters who are responsible for the sale and/or use of television forfeit their membership.⁶

The mustache and fashionable beard are not tolerated in the brotherhood.⁷

The following are prohibited for sisters: cutting, waving, and fashionable combing of the hair. Wearing of bandannas, soft-turban type headgear, hats or other fashionable headgear (except plain warm headgear for extremely cold weather). Immodest dresses with low-cut necks, short sleeves and short skirts. . . . Jewelry of all types including wedding rings. Make-up, lipstick, and nail polish. The cape-dress which is made modestly and long enough to go well below the knees is the standard, with black shoes and stockings.⁸

At this point it may be well to place the Mennonites in the perspective of their Anabaptist history. Christians of the Anabaptist-Mennonite heritage have been described as one of history's most misunderstood groups. Such designation stems from the fact that many historians have been content to refer vaguely to Anabaptism as "the left wing of the Reformation" without troubling to differentiate between the revolutionary and the apocalyptic Munsterites, the communistic Hutterites, and the "evangelical" or "peaceful" Anabaptists. The latter group, from which the Mennonites in America trace their descent, stressed the doctrine of discipleship as the essence of the gospel, adhered to the biblical principle of nonresistance and nonconformity to the world, and renounced Münster's militaristic and chiliastic beliefs.

The evangelical branch of Anabaptists that migrated to America takes its name from Menno Simons (1492-1559) of the Low Countries, a Roman Catholic priest who experienced an evangelical conversion and struck in opposition to tendencies of both the Reformation and Catholicism. Although his theological ideas were not radically different from those of Luther and the other reformers, he particularly opposed their ideas of the church — especially its relation to and reliance on the state. Seeking to escape persecution, Menno's followers began in 1863 to immigrate to America, settling first in Philadelphia. They came mainly from Germany and Switzerland, and they were characterized as honest, law-abiding, thrifty farmers. In theology they were evangelical and extremely conservative. They emphasized their separatist position by settling in rural Mennonite colonies, refraining from participation in the affairs of the state, and insisting on extreme plainness in their style of living.

Elmer Clark notes in *Small Sects in America* that in proportion to their numerical strength the Mennonites are the most divided group of Christians on this continent.⁹ Their 250,000 members belong to at least sixteen separate major sects. In addition, numerous groups choose to maintain no official affiliation. Their strong emphasis on congregational and conference autonomy has given rise to a diversification of beliefs and practices. Thus, the term Mennonite by some definitions may include such sects as the Old Order Amish, who abstain from such modern conveniences as automo-

biles, or the Black Bumper group, who consent to the use of automobiles as long as the chrome parts are painted.

From this point on, my use of the terms Mennonite Church or Mennonite refers to the (Old) Mennonite Church, the largest of the Mennonite bodies, comprising 80,000 North American members in seventeen loosely federated conferences.

In the 1967 *Mennonite General Conference Proceedings* the delegates from these seventeen conferences address themselves to the theme "As He Is, So Are We in the World" (1 John 4:17). In view of the resolutions enacted before the conference ended, the following main points of one of the key sermons might be interpreted to have been presuppositions of the delegates:

THE WORD OF MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

- A. The gospel we have received expresses itself in a social structure.
- B. The church is to be the first and the best illustration of God's reconciling experience.
- C. Ethical implications of the gospel are not optional.
- D. We are the extension of Jesus Christ to the world.
- E. The servanthood style is the prophetic style. Jesus was identified by his deeds.
- F. We have refused to accept our position as the real agents of reconciliation. *Our place is in the world.*
- G. Some obstacles that keep us from being ministers of reconciliation are: (1) our unwillingness to become involved, (2) our poor demonstration in life of what it means to be a Christian, and (3) our sanctuary mentality [p. 15].

That the Mennonites recognize the importance of extending the traditional personal ethic to societal proportions is suggested in the following resolution:

Whereas, It is evident that there is a cleavage in the Christian community between those who hold that only individuals can or need be changed by Christ and those who believe that social and political structures are subject to the lordship of Christ and when in error must be challenged and, if possible, changed, and

Whereas, Our faith has always advocated a "third way," namely that of a personal salvation through the merits of Christ's shed blood which obligates us to carry out a prophetic ministry of challenging every social and political structure which hinders the progress of righteousness,

Let us resolve . . . [to] continue in the "third way" by a vigorous program of teaching within the brotherhood and of witness to those without [p. 118].

Such a resolution may be regarded as a natural extension of article nine of the Mennonite Confession of Faith, which notes that a ministry of reconciliation seeks healing not only for man's spiritual welfare but for his total well-being. Thus, "the church should witness against racial discrimination, economic injustice, and all forms of human slavery and moral degradation."¹⁰

To underscore the general statement that salvation and reconciliation are inseparably personal and social, the delegates proceed to speak to specific issues of social concern. We shall note a few of these.

URBAN RIOTS. A resolution notes that riots in the United States cities have aroused demands for stronger law enforcement measures. Then the resolution flatly states:

(1) As nonresistant Christians we cannot condone that violence and sedition in the U. S. life style which drives the deprived in our midst to acts of violence, (2) the 1967 summer riots are a judgment upon our society, and (3) in penitence we must find ways of going beyond mere charity and handouts to effect healing and reconciliation in the community, encouraging businessmen, educators, and professional people to participate in remolding social structures (pp. 118-119).

PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS. "It is not enough in a troubled time to be good citizens, 'quiet in the land.'" (This statement employs a play on words; the nonresistant and peaceful Mennonite community has long referred to itself as a people "quiet in the land," even singing a German hymn with such a title.) The resolution further terms it "regrettable" that many Mennonites fail to see that most public demonstration on social issues in recent years belongs in the category of peaceful assembly for petitioning, a right guaranteed in the Constitution. The concluding sentence on this subject carries a prophetic admonition: "Let us be vigilant lest our silence in the land (*die Stillen im Lande*) contribute to noise in the land, the noise of destructive conflict" (p. 37).

RACE RELATIONS. Delegates reaffirm in this resolution a 1955 statement titled "The Way of Christian Love in Race Relations." I will not attempt a condensation of this nine-page statement, but two features from it should be noted. They may be considered unique if they are compared with similar statements by other religious groups. First, rather than trying to gloss over the problem by citing support for the assertion that brotherhood has been a longstanding tradition in the Mennonite communion, the resolution bluntly states: We have reexamined ourselves and "humbly confess our sins." Second, the statement is not content to deal in lofty generalities but speaks to such specifics as the question of interracial marriages and stresses the need for the church to "help our people to understand" the irrational character of certain arguments opposing such unions.¹¹

DIVIDED PROTESTANTISM. "With sorrow" the delegates note the current tendency to polarize Protestantism into two distinct camps. "Ecumenical" Protestantism, they say, tends to be rigidly identified with such labels as unification, inclusive membership, intellectual and social concern, theological openness, and witness to social structures. Further, "conservative evangelical" Protestantism is stereotyped by organizational nonessentials, rigid definitions, dogmatic doctrinal statements, emotional rootage in the past, and the evangelization of individuals as the only means to social change. Stressing that this polarization is biblically and practically regrettable, the resolution proceeds to outline specific steps for achieving dialogue and mutual understanding (p. 63).

WAR AND PEACE. Previous action taken by the Mennonites (through their Committee on Peace and Social Concerns) regarding the question of Vietnam includes: sending a lengthy telegram from the 1965 General Conference to the President of the United States; affirming their pacifist position and declaring their resolute opposition to the Vietnam war; publishing special peace issues of the official Mennonite periodicals, *Gospel Herald* and *The Mennonite*, and subsequently delivering copies of the same to the White House; and on numerous occasions discussing with presidential aides and Congressmen the moral implications of the country's current

involvement in Vietnam. Further, the executive secretary engaged in several private conversations with the President's pastor, who transmitted to the President a personal letter which challenged the immoral course of the present conflict. *Proceedings* contains the content of a telegram which the delegates dispatched to Mr. Johnson dealing with the topic of Vietnam and domestic issues. The following excerpt of this communication is illustrative of the tone of the argument:

We cherish the values of law and order, but there can be no lasting order where human needs are ignored. It is our sincere belief that the billions of dollars now expended annually for war, if devoted to constructive purposes — for the improvement of housing, for education, for employment, and for human rights — would go far to restore order and to remove the appeal of violence in our own cities as well as abroad.

We plead with you on behalf of those who suffer in Vietnam, both North and South, and of the deprived in our own midst: turn back from the immoral course on which the nation is now embarked in Vietnam. While the bombing and fighting continue, moral forces in America and around the world which could heal and build are hindered. Surely the arts of diplomacy can fashion new courses of action once the moral issue has been faced [p. 38].

It is perhaps significant that alongside these resolutions dealing with current social problems is a reaffirmation of the "Declaration of Commitment in Respect to Christian Separation and Non-conformity to the World." This declaration includes admonitions with respect to material possessions, dress and external appearance, the use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages, "worldly" association, marriage and divorce, and recreation. The statement concludes with a reference to imminent eschatological hopes and a prayer: "May the Holy Spirit sanctify us wholly so that we may not be ashamed before our Lord at His coming."¹²

The minutes record specific measures designed to provide feedback and to ensure that statements and resolutions in turn are woven into the fabric of Mennonite thought and practice. Conference leadership defines its role as educative and thus faces up to the task of the education of those among the laity who are slow to recognize that "personal salvation and social redemption are not mutually exclusive." The official church periodicals published special issues designed to provoke thought in this area, and one quarter's Sunday School lessons were devoted to biblical studies of such topics as "The Meaning of Salvation," "The Church and the World," "The Task of Christian Reconciliation," and "The Christian's Responsibility."

Further, the idea of itinerant and visitation ministries under the designation of "Peace Teams" has been revived so that over the next three-year period there may be continued discussion on the nature and mission of the church in all Mennonite communities. The purpose of this educative emphasis is "intensive conversation in every congregation concerning the public, or social, responsibilities that are implicit in the redeemed life" (p. 37).

Additional efforts to transfer resolutions into action include the development of contacts in legislative circles and the continued encouragement of the layman to communicate to his official representative a prophetic witness of key social issues.

The appeal to the laity is for the purpose not only of implementing programs but

also of defining problems. To provide "further development of our understanding and expression of the Anabaptist vision in relation to the forces of modern life," the skills of competent lay members are utilized through the Institute of Mennonite Studies:

With regard to the help of specialists, the mandate of the CPSC [Committee on Peace and Social Concerns] covers too broadly diverse areas for the committee officer or even the committee members to develop the necessary competence. At the same time, members of the churches can now be found in many specialized areas — science, economics, international affairs, psychology, sociology, law, etc. — where church concerns or needs may arise. The secretaries of the agencies . . . are currently recruiting a number of consultants who will be able to attend meetings of specialized agencies, report to the executive officers, and then be available as consultants for work in the churches [p. 30].

62

In seeking to respond to the problem of social responsibility, the Mennonites are addressing themselves, of course, to a complex problem with which the entire Christian church has been continually involved: what is the church to do about the world? The two most obvious solutions have proved equally frustrating. An attempt to remove itself from the stream of history by various forms of withdrawal has not proved to be the answer. Nor has the attempt to impose a Christian world culture been any more successful.

The three main types of Christian thought and organization enumerated by Ernst Troeltsch — the church, the sect, and mysticism — have become classic typologies.¹³ All three are seen as having roots in the gospel and the primitive church, and each has a distinct approach to society at large. In addition to other indices, the church is an inclusive religious institution that emphasizes the universality of the gospel. In desiring to coexist with society it accepts the secular order and may become an integral part of existing social structures. The sect, in contrast, is a voluntary religious association limited to believers who have experienced the new birth and who subscribe to a given body of doctrines. It practices a detachment from the world, is exclusive, has no intention of evangelizing the secular order, and takes the Sermon on the Mount as its ideal while laying stress on the simple but radical opposition of the kingdom of God to all secular interests and institutions. Mysticism has no formal requirements but stresses instead a personal and inward experience and assumes no lasting forms or structures.

Christianity as a sociological phenomenon thus faces the paradox of a demand for sanctification of the self and detachment from the world, and at the same time a demand for brotherly love that overcomes in God the tensions and struggles of the external order. "The history of the Christian Ethos," says Troeltsch, "becomes the story of a constantly renewed search for this compromise, and of fresh opposition to this spirit of compromise."¹⁴

Recognizing the creativity in form and structure that has resulted in history from this tension between church and sect, the Mennonites now appear eager to program conflict into their framework by seeking to incorporate (a) those elements of the church that allow it to work within the structures of the social order and to enter the problems of society as a whole, and (b) those elements of the sect that serve to

caution against accommodation and interpretation of the Christian ideal strictly in terms of cultural definitions.

Niebuhr in *Social Sources of Denominationalism* graphically points out that one of the subtle dangers of modern democratic life for Christians is to have their social sense cultivated and their responsibility defined by social forces alone.¹⁵ No matter what form social responsibility may take, it must be regarded as an attempt to serve in accordance with the kingdom of God and not simply with the Great Society. Only as this creative tension exists may those church-type attributes that call for witness to and through the social and political structures be tempered by sect-type cautions as the activist is continually called upon to reappraise his basis for involvement.

It may be that the Mennonites are simply making the familiar transition from sect to church after a four-hundred-year hibernation. On the other hand, in view of the present balance that they seek to maintain, there is the very real possibility that Menno's followers are finding answers to a question that more evangelical Protestants might be posing: "How may we make the peculiar doctrines and practices of the faith meaningful to the world and relevant to existing social ills?"

And for the individual who is tempted to suggest casually that the Mennonite is in fact replacing his eschatological hope with "mere" activism in the present realm, the Mennonite has his thoughtful reply: "From our manner in waiting can be judged to which kingdom we belong."

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Lancaster Conference, 1943), p. 13.
- 2 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Alberta-Saskatchewan Conference, 1946), p. 34.
- 3 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Virginia Conference, 1948), p. 9.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Franconia Conference, 1947), p. 51.
- 6 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Lancaster Conference, 1943), p. 17.
- 7 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Indiana-Michigan Conference, 1951), p. 48.
- 8 Mennonite Church, *Discipline* (Franconia Conference, 1947), p. 52.
- 9 Elmer T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America* (revised edition. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949).
- 10 Mennonite Confession of Faith adopted by the Mennonite General Conference, August 22, 1963. Reprinted in J. C. Wenger, *The Mennonite Church in America, Sometimes Called Old Mennonites* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1966).
- 11 The Way of Christian Love in Race Relations, adopted by the Mennonite General Conference, August 24, 1955. Reprinted in J. C. Wenger.
- 12 Declaration of Commitment in Respect to Christian Separation and Nonconformity to the World. Reprinted in J. C. Wenger.
- 13 Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (translated by Olive Wyon. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931). First published in 1911 under the title *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*.
- 14 Troeltsch, p. 999.
- 15 H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1929), p. 21 ff.

The Ultimate Concern?

ARTHUR HAUCK

THE VIRTUE OF SELFISHNESS

By Ayn Rand

The American Library of World Literature, New York, 1964 144 pp paper \$.60

64

For those who still pause long enough to ponder the right or wrong of an incipient attitude or an anticipated act, the pivotal questions seem to be by what law, by which principle, by whose standard should judgments and decisions be made? Whenever these questions enter the public forum, the pendulum swings erratically from society's mores on the one extreme to heaven's "absolutes" on the other. In her presentation of the moral principles of objectivism, Rand brings the pendulum to rest somewhere in the center at a point marked "self," with the assertion that "the Objectivist ethics holds man's life as the *standard* of value — and *his own life* as the ethical *purpose* of every individual man" (p. 19).

According to Rand "the three cardinal values of the Objectivist ethics — the three values which, together, are the means to the realization of one's ultimate value, one's own life — are: Reason, Purpose, and Self-Esteem, with their three corresponding virtues: Rationality, Productiveness, Pride" (pp. 19-20). In this final motley triumvirate, rationality is accorded the highest place as man's basic virtue and the source of all other virtues. Rand describes pride as "moral ambitiousness" and strongly rejects "any doctrine that preaches self-immolation as a moral virtue or duty" (p. 22). With man's mind firmly fastened to his own bootstraps, pride provides the impetus for man to pluck himself out of the muck of altruism and hold himself suspended in self-space with a grim grin on his somber face as to himself he loudly lauds the virtue of selfishness. Rand affirms that "the basic *social* principle of Objectivist ethics is that just as life is an end in itself, so every living human being is an end in himself, not the means to the ends or the welfare of others — and, therefore, that man must live for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself. To live for his own sake means that *the achievement of his own happiness is man's highest moral purpose*" (pp. 22-23).

This stubborn egoistic stance seems to frighten the willy-nilly Christian and threaten to unmask the pious hypocrisy of those who must use or abuse others, often in the name of their god, in order to reach the place they feel they deserve in the sun. The good that many sporadically do for others is prompted only by an omnivorous appetite for a subsequent pie in the sky. According to Rand, "the principle of *trade* is the only rational ethical principle for all human relationships, personal and social, private and public, spiritual and material. It is the principle of *justice*" (p. 29).

She defines "a trader [as] a man who earns what he gets and does not . . . treat men as masters or slaves, but as independent equals. He deals with men by means of a free, voluntary, unforced, uncoerced exchange — an exchange which benefits both parties by their own independent judgment. A trader does not expect to be paid for his defaults, only for his achievements. He does not switch to others the burden of

his failures, and he does not mortgage his life into bondage to the failure of others" (p. 29).

This book consists of a collection of essays by Ayn Rand and a number of additional articles by Nathaniel Branden. After introducing the essential tenets of Objectivist ethics, the writers move into a wide range of contemporary problems such as intimidation, counterfeit individualism, racism, the nature of government, man's rights, the cult of moral grayness. They ask and ponder the questions: Isn't everyone selfish? Doesn't life require compromise? How does one lead a rational life in an irrational society?

In his reason-bound schema of reality, the Objectivist has no place for faith. He refers to it as "a malignancy that no system can tolerate with impunity," with the further qualification that "the man who succumbs to it, will call on it in precisely those issues where he needs his reason most" (p. 38). Despite all of his apparent air of bravado, the humanistic Objectivist seems to be whistling in the dark, a lonely itinerant without any "invisible" means of support. With his ultimate commitment to that which is less than ultimate, self, he cannot ever hope to regain that requisite relationship with his Maker and subsequent interaction with his fellow man, mediated by love, to acquire that wholeness which is holiness, which is blessedness, which is happiness.

A Story of Friendship

R. EDWARD JOHNSON

THE CHOSEN

By Chaim Potok

Simon and Schuster, Inc., New York, 1967 284 pp \$4.95 paper \$.95

The Chosen is a moving story of both generational and religious conflict among Hasidic and orthodox Jews in the late 1940's. The incidents that take place in a tiny section of Williamsburg in Brooklyn have universal implications. The struggles of Jewry in this regional microcosm are parabolic of the quest of those of each generation and religion who see themselves as "the chosen." Through this remarkable book, which offers a great deal of information about the complexities of Talmudic study, the origins of Hasidism, and Jewish customs, Potok portrays the intricacy and poignancy of human relations.

The protagonists are two fifteen-year-old boys, sensitive Reuven Malter and brilliant but troubled Danny Saunders, and their fathers. Danny is a member of the ultraorthodox sect distinguished by earlocks, broadbrimmed hats, and long, black overcoats. His father, Reb Saunders, is a tzaddik, a Hasidic rabbi, who believes that his sect alone is fulfilling God's will. Custom demands that Danny follow his father

his failures, and he does not mortgage his life into bondage to the failure of others" (p. 29).

This book consists of a collection of essays by Ayn Rand and a number of additional articles by Nathaniel Branden. After introducing the essential tenets of Objectivist ethics, the writers move into a wide range of contemporary problems such as intimidation, counterfeit individualism, racism, the nature of government, man's rights, the cult of moral grayness. They ask and ponder the questions: Isn't everyone selfish? Doesn't life require compromise? How does one lead a rational life in an irrational society?

In his reason-bound schema of reality, the Objectivist has no place for faith. He refers to it as "a malignancy that no system can tolerate with impunity," with the further qualification that "the man who succumbs to it, will call on it in precisely those issues where he needs his reason most" (p. 38). Despite all of his apparent air of bravado, the humanistic Objectivist seems to be whistling in the dark, a lonely itinerant without any "invisible" means of support. With his ultimate commitment to that which is less than ultimate, self, he cannot ever hope to regain that requisite relationship with his Maker and subsequent interaction with his fellow man, mediated by love, to acquire that wholeness which is holiness, which is blessedness, which is happiness.

A Story of Friendship

R. EDWARD JOHNSON

THE CHOSEN

By Chaim Potok

Simon and Schuster, Inc., New York, 1967 284 pp \$4.95 paper \$.95

The Chosen is a moving story of both generational and religious conflict among Hasidic and orthodox Jews in the late 1940's. The incidents that take place in a tiny section of Williamsburg in Brooklyn have universal implications. The struggles of Jewry in this regional microcosm are parabolic of the quest of those of each generation and religion who see themselves as "the chosen." Through this remarkable book, which offers a great deal of information about the complexities of Talmudic study, the origins of Hasidism, and Jewish customs, Potok portrays the intricacy and poignancy of human relations.

The protagonists are two fifteen-year-old boys, sensitive Reuven Malter and brilliant but troubled Danny Saunders, and their fathers. Danny is a member of the ultraorthodox sect distinguished by earlocks, broadbrimmed hats, and long, black overcoats. His father, Reb Saunders, is a tzaddik, a Hasidic rabbi, who believes that his sect alone is fulfilling God's will. Custom demands that Danny follow his father

as the sect's leader, though he is personally inclined toward psychology. Reuven practices a liberal Judaism. Malter, his father, is a Zionist writer and scholar.

Conflict begins with a rousing softball game between the two yeshiva (parochial) schools. A fever of competition drives the Hasidic team to defend its religious honor. Generations of Hasidic hatred for the Apikoros (educated Jews who deny basic tenets of the faith) seem now to be present in the overwhelming urge to "kill Reuven." Sensitive Reuven is frightened by the inordinate drive to win. "I felt as if all the previous years of my life had led me somehow to this one ball game and all the future years of my life would depend upon its outcome." Danny, a vicious place hitter, slams a line drive into Reuven's face. The hit shatters Reuven's glasses and lodges a fragment in the cornea of his left eye. Danny visits Reuven in the hospital while Reuven's sight hangs in the balance.

The vision of his newfound friend is recovered. Danny reevaluates his sect's concept of "the Chosen," and out of this incident a motif for the book emerges. Regaining the sight of the injured eye becomes the means by which the whole world is brought into clearer focus. The two former enemies see the parochial nature of their hatred. Danny begins to question his father and Hasidic ways. Both boys realize instinctively that it is the human factor in man, not the divine, that breeds distance and misunderstanding. Through this new perspective, the heterogeneous character of man becomes a delight to be appreciated and not a wrong to be deplored. The conflict that separated the boys serves to fuse their friendship. They even admire and respect rather than damn their religious differences.

Destined by Hasid custom to inherit his father's mantle of authority in the sect, Danny is brought up "in silence," that he might "know compassion," for "words conceal the heart." Reb Saunders believes silence to be the only relationship that a father and son should enjoy beyond the rigors of Talmudic study. In *The Chosen*, silence is the means of instruction, the ultimate in communication between a man and his soul. It has unique quality and dimension. Far from being a void, silence becomes a means to participate in and shape reality. Between the warmth of friendship and the ugliness of hatred, silence captures the characters' greatest moments of life. "The tzaddik sits in absolute silence, saying nothing, and all his followers listen attentively." As the Talmud says, "A word is worth one coin, silence is worth two."

Danny is not content with only Talmudic study, and his curiosity and intelligence carry him beyond the rigid confines of Hasidic ritual. His is the quest of youth who seek to relieve themselves of the traditions of a previous generation, to build their own futures. Danny goes secretly to the public library to read the "forbidden books," because his sect prohibits "secular works" of literature, science, and especially psychology. Extensive reading soon develops within him a growing interest in Freud. He wishes that he did not have to be a rabbi. An anguished struggle follows as he seeks to escape from the choking orthodoxy without breaking his father's heart. As a serious student, devoted to faith and family, he feels that rebellion is a hideous act.

The fathers split over the issue of Zionism. Reb Saunders, believing the Messiah will set up the kingdom when he comes, opposes the state of Israel as an interference of man. Consequently, he forbids Danny to associate with Reuven. Though disagreeing, Malter, the more liberal Talmudic scholar, feels that "honest differences of

opinion should never be permitted to destroy a friendship. . . . Ideas should be fought with ideas, not with blind passion." Refusing to tolerate the bitterness of his son toward Reb Saunders, Malter observes, "The fanaticism of men like Reb Saunders kept us alive for two thousand years of exile."

The two families are finally reconciled and the silence between the fathers is ended. Through Reuven, Reb Saunders reveals himself to Danny and thus frees his son to be a man. While Danny studies to be a psychologist, Reuven, ironically, enters the rabbinate.

The central theme of *The Chosen* is friendship. Friendship permeates the story and brings other themes into its larger perspective. The relationship of the two boys contrasts with the wide separation of their fathers. Reuven's father encourages his son to build lasting friendships; the conservative Reb Saunders does not like his son to "mix with outsiders." Yet they both agree with the Talmud, which says, "A person should do two things: one is to acquire a teacher, the other, choose a friend." In *The Chosen*, Potok dissolves generational and religious conflict in the depth of friendship. A knowledge of this abiding relationship helps us to see that all who choose a friend are in some sense *the chosen*.

How Can Man Find God?

PAUL O. CAMPBELL

JESUS, THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD

By R. Rubin Widmer

Southern Publishing Association, Nashville, 1967 142 pp \$4.50

To consider three views on how the light of salvation comes to men, Widmer classifies theologians — the liberals, the neotheologians, and the evangelicals — and explains the views of each group. He recognizes that theologians in the same group may differ and that group boundaries are not distinct, yet he names specific men as representatives of each group.

The liberals, as do the other two groups, believe that Christ is the One Light; but also they hold that all religions have some truth and that, hence, Christianity is not unique. According to this view, inspiration is not in the Word but in the message; emphasis is on the authority of man because of his judgment in science, his knowledge of history, and his feeling for worship.

According to the neotheologians and the evangelicals, Christ is the Light and reveals himself through the Scriptures, nature, and direct revelation. The evangelical view distinguishes itself from the neotheological view by the relative emphasis on the method of revelation: that knowledge obtainable through nature is not sufficient for salvation; that light is not automatically available; that God limits himself to working through men and the Holy Spirit.

opinion should never be permitted to destroy a friendship. . . . Ideas should be fought with ideas, not with blind passion." Refusing to tolerate the bitterness of his son toward Reb Saunders, Malter observes, "The fanaticism of men like Reb Saunders kept us alive for two thousand years of exile."

The two families are finally reconciled and the silence between the fathers is ended. Through Reuven, Reb Saunders reveals himself to Danny and thus frees his son to be a man. While Danny studies to be a psychologist, Reuven, ironically, enters the rabbinate.

The central theme of *The Chosen* is friendship. Friendship permeates the story and brings other themes into its larger perspective. The relationship of the two boys contrasts with the wide separation of their fathers. Reuven's father encourages his son to build lasting friendships; the conservative Reb Saunders does not like his son to "mix with outsiders." Yet they both agree with the Talmud, which says, "A person should do two things: one is to acquire a teacher, the other, choose a friend." In *The Chosen*, Potok dissolves generational and religious conflict in the depth of friendship. A knowledge of this abiding relationship helps us to see that all who choose a friend are in some sense *the chosen*.

How Can Man Find God?

PAUL O. CAMPBELL

JESUS, THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD

By R. Rubin Widmer

Southern Publishing Association, Nashville, 1967 142 pp \$4.50

To consider three views on how the light of salvation comes to men, Widmer classifies theologians — the liberals, the neotheologians, and the evangelicals — and explains the views of each group. He recognizes that theologians in the same group may differ and that group boundaries are not distinct, yet he names specific men as representatives of each group.

The liberals, as do the other two groups, believe that Christ is the One Light; but also they hold that all religions have some truth and that, hence, Christianity is not unique. According to this view, inspiration is not in the Word but in the message; emphasis is on the authority of man because of his judgment in science, his knowledge of history, and his feeling for worship.

According to the neotheologians and the evangelicals, Christ is the Light and reveals himself through the Scriptures, nature, and direct revelation. The evangelical view distinguishes itself from the neotheological view by the relative emphasis on the method of revelation: that knowledge obtainable through nature is not sufficient for salvation; that light is not automatically available; that God limits himself to working through men and the Holy Spirit.

Widmer's book seems to be the first of its kind published by Adventists, and thus it fills a place, especially for younger theologians, in Adventist literature. A preface in which the author shared his motives for this writing would have been helpful. The bibliography of 110 authors and 157 sources is impressive.

The first four chapters deal with the problem of how men are saved, and in them Widmer enumerates the contributions made by the theologians from each of the three groups. These chapters contain material that can be discussed in complimentary terms only. Chapter five, however, sets forth some personal interpretations of the following that should be reexamined: (1) that Christ is the only Light of the world, (2) that Christ is the personification of those characteristics we call light, (3) that, therefore, "there is none other name . . . whereby we must be saved," and (4) that without light there is no salvation.

Adventist Christians will agree with these statements. It is Widmer's interpretation of the four statements that can be questioned. His view of the gospel commission and his belief that God gives light almost wholly through human beings lead him to the conclusion that many persons may be lost because some Christian failed to tell them of Jesus. This conclusion needs critical review.

The author uses John 1:9 ("That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world") to make the point that Christ is the only Light. But he endeavors to sidestep the usual interpretation of "every man." At least twenty translators express the concept in varied language, but all retain the idea of "every man." We must discuss this idea. As do most Christians, Widmer believes that Jesus is the Light personified. But what are the personified qualities that we call light? Here we must define some terms.

The word *light* is translated from a Greek word that means to shine, to make manifest, to show, to appear, to lighten by rays, or to be seen. To know Jesus we must see him in action with love and forgiveness shining through for our salvation. The light of the gospel is not mere theoretical knowledge of God's character; it is the experiential knowledge that leads to our rebirth.

A pertinent question is: How much light is light? Does any human have all the light, or is light shining "more and more unto the perfect day" (Proverbs 4:18)? Some light must shine upon all men, for this is the "true light, which lighteth every man" (John 1:9). "Every man" will have enough light on which to base a decision.

The light of God and his name are one, "for there is none other name . . . whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). The word *name* comes to the English through the Latin (*nomen*) from the Greek (*onoma*) and designates a person or an entity, but it also means character or authority. The last two of these definitions apply especially to the word *name* in this scripture. A word or symbol means no more than that which it represents. The six-letter word *Christ* has no potency as ink and paper. It is the character and authority of the Person represented that has the saving light of love and forgiveness.

Love, joy, and peace are attributes of God's character. Men who accept these attributes, even though they do not know of the divine source, are accepting gifts of light from God. "Every good gift . . . is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights" (James 1:17). The continued acceptance of any godly characteristic will lead the acceptor to salvation.

Widmer believes that light from Christ is necessary for salvation and that without that light no one is saved. Are there degrees of reflection from Infinite Light? How much of the character of God do any of us understand? If salvation does not take total understanding, at what point do we make the distinction between enough light for salvation and not quite enough? If one accepts love, which is a gift from heaven, and follows it, will he not have increasing light, and will he not be following Christ, who said, "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you" (John 12:35)? No one can remain in darkness, however meager his light, if he continues to pursue that light. If a man finds himself in darkness, he will be unable to blame anyone but himself.

Widmer emphasizes the gospel commission, which bids all Christians to "teach all nations" (Matthew 28:19). This is good, but what is the reason for this commission? Paul writes: "For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity [constraint in growth or movement, as having an arm bent with intensity; see Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance*] is laid upon me; yea, woe [an exclamation of grief, as *alas*] is unto me, if I preach not the gospel" (1 Corinthians 9:16). Paul's reason for preaching was a personal one. The "woe" was on Paul, not on the heathen, if he failed. By preaching, he threw off the constraint and walked in increasing light with the joy of seeing others begin to grow. Had he unrepentantly failed to preach to the heathen, he would have been lost. However, when one does not do his appointed work, God calls another. In the parable of the talents, the one talent was taken from the nonuser and was given to the user. (See Matthew 25:14-24.) God raised Paul to preach to the gentiles. Had Paul failed, God would have used other means. When the Hebrews objected to the children's shouting praise at Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Christ said, "If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke 19:40). God's light must shine whether humans reflect it or not.

Widmer believes that God gives light mostly through human beings, and I would agree; but persons are not always the means, and even when humans are used they are not always saints. Can we limit God in the ways he gives light? There are at least four major ways by which God speaks to men — directly, through the Bible, through other humans, and through nature.

God has dealt directly with many men, from Adam to John the Revelator and on to the present time. God does not cease this personal confrontation. Joel wrote: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:28). Too often we think of this not as "all flesh" but rather as "the leaders" or "the righteous," but hardly ever as "the heathen."

The Bible gives instances in which God gave guidance by direct confrontation. In visions and dreams God spoke to heathens like Nebuchadnezzar, Pharaoh, Abimelech, and others. He spoke through backsliders like Balaam, Saul, and Caiaphas. He gave guidance to Cornelius, the light-seeking Roman. God has communicated directly with saints, sinners, and heathen.

God reveals himself through the Bible, but the Bible has not always existed, and even now millions do not have it. God plans to do something for people thus deprived, because the light must shine on "every man."

God planned for humans to spread the light as part of their Christian exercise, and

so he gave the gospel commission. Yet God has not depended wholly on man. God wants us to do missionary work not merely for the sake of unbelievers, but that our experience as collaborators with him might enrich our lives.

For those who cannot be reached by believers, God is not without a plan. The Holy Spirit pleads with men, and when the Spirit's coming is welcomed, it gives guidance. Jesus said, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13). The Holy Spirit seals men and that sealing is done by placing love in their hearts. (See Ephesians 4:30 and Romans 5:5.) Love is a gift from above, and anyone who follows love is following the Holy Spirit. He will be guided into "all truth."

As far as telling the world of Jesus, Christians are farther behind now than they were a hundred years ago, for men are being born and are dying faster than Christians are reaching them. Does that mean that God will be thwarted in his endeavor to let light shine on "every man"? I believe not. "He will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness" (Romans 9:28). How will he do this? He will use willing men, but he is not dependent on an army of humans. "Not by might [margin, *army*], nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zechariah 4:6). God will succeed, for, as John wrote, "the earth was lightened with . . . glory" (Revelation 18:1).

Paul believed that other creatures than human beings participate in this work. Speaking of angels (Hebrews 1:14) he wrote, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Some of those heirs have not yet heard or believed, but they will hear even if angels have to tell them, for they are included in the "every man."

"Every man" will be judged. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Romans 14:10). No one can be judged without light. Paul indicates that sin came to all men through Adam's sin, but that "even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men" (Romans 5:18). The expression "all men" includes the heathen and the gentiles, but of course not all men accept the proffered righteousness.

The Hebrews received the law at Sinai. The rest of the nations were supposed to receive it through the Hebrews, or later through Christians. Hebrews and Christians have not always been willing to fulfill God's plan. Some of the heathen or gentiles, whether because of lack of zeal or lack of facilities, will have to receive the promised light through nature. "For there is no respect of persons [including people of every environment] with God. For as many as have sinned without law [or without the knowledge of the written law] shall also perish without law . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel" (Romans 2:11-16).

Those who perish without law perish because they have rejected the little light which came to them. Those who are saved because of the writing in their hearts are saved without knowledge of the written law. The writing in their hearts is by the Holy Spirit. (See Hebrews 8:10 and 2 Corinthians 3:3-6.) Here Paul says that God judges men according to their capacity, their environment, and the light that has come to them. David was in accord with Paul. "The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there" (Psalm 87:6).

Paul believed that any excuse because of ignorance was removed by light from

nature and created works. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them [margin, *to them*]; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they [Greeks and barbarians, verse 14] are without excuse [margin, *that they be without excuse*]" (Romans 1:19, 20). Therefore, even though no missionary may have gone to them, God says that "they are without excuse." The belief that the heathen will be lost unless God's people go to them is not in accord with Paul's writings. If some particular man will be lost because I do not warn him, what particular aborigine in what far-off country is my special responsibility?

God never damns anyone for another's sin. It is "the soul that sinneth" that "shall die" (Ezekiel 18:4), not the one sinned against. Neither sin nor righteousness is transferable from one human to another. "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness" (Ezekiel 14:14).

Some fear that motivation of the church to missionary work will be lessened if the gentiles can hear the gospel even though Christians do not tell them. Perhaps the idea that the unwarned heathen will be lost is supported by some in order to maintain the motivation of the church. But fallacy is weaker than truth, even though both may motivate a good work.

Any sin, whether of omission or commission, may be forgiven. For God to forgive one for the sin of omission, then damn a neighbor for that sin which another committed, does violence to the Bible and to God's nature as the Saviour. Ignorance is excusable if there is no light. A man's accountability begins with information. There is never a time in a man's experience when he knows everything pertaining to salvation; yet every man is required to make his decision.¹

The sins of ignorance are different from the sins of presumption, and God deals with them in a different way. Sins of ignorance God "winks at," but with light God requires repentance. Rejection of light makes a sinner presumptive. He is unforgiven, not because God is unforgiving, but because the sinner doesn't want forgiveness.²

Would it not be strange if Christ died for all men, and then left some with no chance? Could he give men free choice, then not allow light to come to them so they could use that choice?

I conclude, then, that none will be lost because of mere ignorance, for no one will be completely ignorant; that no one will be lost because of another's sin of omission, for guilt is not thus transferable; and that no one will be without sufficient light for salvation, even though God may have to use means other than those intended. There are too many expressions like "all men" for anyone to be overlooked in the distribution of light. John was in accord with the rest of the Bible when he wrote, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John 1:9).

NOTES

- 1 Some will say that this is incompatible with the second commandment, part of which reads, "I . . . am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers . . . unto the third and fourth generation" (Exodus 20:5). The verse does not say whether it is the guilt of the iniquity that is visited on the descendants, or the weakness

resulting from the iniquitous action of the fathers. If we interpret this visitation to be the guilt of the iniquity, we contradict the rest of the Bible; therefore we must interpret it as the weakness. Ezekiel wrote, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son" (Ezekiel 18:20).

- 2 God's treatment of ignorance and of presumption is discussed in Numbers 15:24-31. Only the presumptive ones perish, unless they repent. Peter dealt with some ignorance on the day of Pentecost. (See Acts 3:14-19.) When Light banished the crucifier's ignorance, God required action, and thousands repented.

Brief Reviews

COMPARATIVE ODONTOLOGY

By Bernard Peyer; translated and edited by Rainer Zangerl

University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968 xiv plus 347 pp \$22.50

This book is the result of the dual effort of a German scientist and the chief curator of the department of geology of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. The death of Bernard Peyer in 1963 interrupted the publication of *Comparative Odontology*, and the book was subsequently translated from German into English and published by Zangerl.

This is a book intended primarily for the scientist. Despite the fact that it pertains to teeth, it is of only academic concern to the practicing dentist. Its highly technical terminology and detailed descriptions exclude it from ever becoming a best seller. As a reference book and as a scientific publication, it is probably the best in its field.

Probably no structures in living organisms manifest such variation in form as do dentitions. From the horny denticle of the lamprey and the polyphyodont dentition of the shark, to the highly differentiated teeth of some vertebrates, tremendous differences may be seen. Of particular interest are the tusk of the elephant (which is actually an incisor) and the hollow tubular fang of the rattlesnake.

As might be expected, Peyer and Zangerl support the theory of organic evolution and occasionally make reference to the changes in morphology of the teeth as the creature adapted itself to its environment. Of the 347 pages, however, only 17 are devoted to theories of evolution.

It has often been posed that the shapes of the teeth affected the eating habits of the animals; e.g., herbivorous animals have corrugated enamel plates for grinding grasses and herbs, whereas carnivorous animals, in contrast, have pointed, knifelike cutting edges to sever tendons and flesh of their prey. In this regard the authors have an interesting comment.

As a systematic criterion, the mode of feeding is usable only with caution, because in different, unquestionably natural, groups of mammals there are both carnivores and herbivorous forms; for example, among the marsupials. Even omnivorous forms and

resulting from the iniquitous action of the fathers. If we interpret this visitation to be the guilt of the iniquity, we contradict the rest of the Bible; therefore we must interpret it as the weakness. Ezekiel wrote, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son" (Ezekiel 18:20).

- 2 God's treatment of ignorance and of presumption is discussed in Numbers 15:24-31. Only the presumptive ones perish, unless they repent. Peter dealt with some ignorance on the day of Pentecost. (See Acts 3:14-19.) When Light banished the crucifier's ignorance, God required action, and thousands repented.

Brief Reviews

COMPARATIVE ODONTOLOGY

By Bernard Peyer; translated and edited by Rainer Zangerl

University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968 xiv plus 347 pp \$22.50

This book is the result of the dual effort of a German scientist and the chief curator of the department of geology of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. The death of Bernard Peyer in 1963 interrupted the publication of *Comparative Odontology*, and the book was subsequently translated from German into English and published by Zangerl.

This is a book intended primarily for the scientist. Despite the fact that it pertains to teeth, it is of only academic concern to the practicing dentist. Its highly technical terminology and detailed descriptions exclude it from ever becoming a best seller. As a reference book and as a scientific publication, it is probably the best in its field.

Probably no structures in living organisms manifest such variation in form as do dentitions. From the horny denticle of the lamprey and the polyphyodont dentition of the shark, to the highly differentiated teeth of some vertebrates, tremendous differences may be seen. Of particular interest are the tusk of the elephant (which is actually an incisor) and the hollow tubular fang of the rattlesnake.

As might be expected, Peyer and Zangerl support the theory of organic evolution and occasionally make reference to the changes in morphology of the teeth as the creature adapted itself to its environment. Of the 347 pages, however, only 17 are devoted to theories of evolution.

It has often been posed that the shapes of the teeth affected the eating habits of the animals; e.g., herbivorous animals have corrugated enamel plates for grinding grasses and herbs, whereas carnivorous animals, in contrast, have pointed, knifelike cutting edges to sever tendons and flesh of their prey. In this regard the authors have an interesting comment.

As a systematic criterion, the mode of feeding is usable only with caution, because in different, unquestionably natural, groups of mammals there are both carnivores and herbivorous forms; for example, among the marsupials. Even omnivorous forms and

the giant panda (*Ailuropoda melanoleuca*) feed exclusively on bamboo shoots. The extinct cave bear is assumed to have also been a vegetarian [p. 192].

It is remarkable that the porpoise (delphinids), with highly developed intelligence, has 250 or more small, simple cone-shaped teeth, very similar to those of reptiles, whereas other mammals with a much lower intelligence have more differentiated dentition of specific formulae. No explanation is given for this.

Another interesting comparison involves the male and female of a single species.

A very extraordinary enlargement of a single tooth occurs in the male of the narwhal (*Monodon*); in this form the permanently growing, usually left, incisor may reach a length of over two meters. The right incisor remains hidden in the gingiva, as do both the incisors of the female. This is probably the most extreme case of sexual dimorphism in the dentition [p. 272].

73

The book is extremely well organized, a matter of no small moment for a reference book about teeth of all animals, both living and extinct. Histologic considerations are provided throughout the text. The book is well documented and well illustrated with drawings, photographs, and color plates.

LLOYD BAUM

BAPTISM THROUGH THE CENTURIES

By Henry F. Brown

Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California, 1965 122 pp
32 pp of illustrations cloth \$4.25

The author introduces his subject by pointing out that baptism did not originate with the Christian church but was practiced as a purification rite in ancient pagan religions. In Judaism it was known as a form of initiation. Thus the baptism of John was not unique as a rite but common as an existing ceremony. John's baptism, indicating a response to the Baptist's message of repentance, was accepted by Christ and his disciples and thus became part of primitive Christianity. Paul saw a significance for it deeper than a mere symbol of purification or an initiation rite of fellowship. He regarded baptism as a sign of burying the past life and as a revolutionary transformation of the person.

Brown notes the influence of pagan philosophy and rites on the meaning and practice of baptism during the first three centuries A.D. "Thus the heresy of salvation by water baptism was taught, rather than salvation in Christ through repentance."

Infant baptism in the early church is mentioned by Origen (ca. 185-254), and was advocated by Augustine (354-430), but adult baptism was the rule during the first six centuries. The introduction and finally the requirement of the baptism of infants made necessary the adoption of new and strange doctrines, such as the assigning of infants to the "misery of the damned" if they died without having been baptized.

The author then discusses the origin of sprinkling and pouring as substitutes for immersion. He calls attention to the witness of ancient baptisteries, and the illustration of the rite of baptism on monuments through sculpture, frescos, and mosaics. This section is enriched with thirty pages of photographs.

The history of the protest against the alterations of the biblical mode of baptism is given only nine pages. The author closes his discourse by calling attention, very briefly, to the fact that a number of writers from various churches have recently advocated abandoning the baptism of infants and limiting baptism to converted adults.

Although the book is entitled *Baptism Through the Centuries*, the author's primary purpose seems to be to present the archaeological evidence on the history of this rite. This little book is well written and well documented, and one could only wish that the author had expanded it so that greater justice could have been done to the many interesting phases of the subject.

M.C.

BOOK REVIEWS. Since the quality and variety of reviews can best be maintained and improved with a wide base of participation, readers are encouraged to submit reviews of books that they feel are of special interest or importance. Information on editorial criteria and manuscript format, which may be helpful to prospective reviewers, is available from the book review editor, Bruce E. Trumbo, 315 Inwood Lane, Hayward, California 94544. Inquiries about reviews should also be directed to this address. All other *typescripts* and *letters of comment* for publication, however, should be sent to the Editor, Box 866, Loma Linda, California 92354.

LETTERS

Doctor Provonsha's "An Ethic of Responsibility" [Spring 1969] leaves me wishing we could be more positive and practical in our approach to the problem of how a Christian ought to behave in a modern world.

It seems to me that he has done only what other Adventist writers and speakers are wont to do when discussing the subject of ethics: they take a stand and tilt at the other side. Now it may be that this is the only thing we can do in the circumstances. It may be that Situationism is so right, and legalism is so wrong, that we must defend the one and attack the other.

But what about the Christian who wants to walk down the "middle of the right road?" the one who appreciates the fact that circumstances alter cases, but does not want to be lost in the fog of relativism? the one who, although he rejects legalism as invalid, is anxious not to lose sight of law lest in doing so he forget an aspect of God and his universe that is as vital as the principle of love? Is there nothing we can contribute to the enlightenment of such an individual?

What tantalizes me about Doctor Provonsha's article is that there is a recognition of the importance of premises. He says on page 7: "The conclusions of this method, as in all matters involving logic, are *only as valid as their premises*" (the italics are my own). On page 8 he says: "What should be criticized is the *premises upon which many in our time are basing their moral decisions*" (again, my own italics). Yet Doctor Provonsha only hints at some possible premises, such as a revelation from God.

I agree wholeheartedly that premises shape one's ethic, even a "responsible ethic." It was Fletcher's plainly stated premises that turned me away from some of his conclusions. No doubt Doctor Provonsha has his basic premises on which he is prepared to build his ethic of responsibility. Could he outline these for us in an article? Perhaps the article or series of articles could be called: Bases for a Viable Christian Ethic. Perhaps others like Joseph Barnes and William Loveless could contribute to the series.

Was the phrase *with exception* [p. 9] a misprint for *without exception*?

G. ARTHUR KEOUGH
Washington, D. C.

EDITOR: Yes.

Godfrey Anderson [Letters, Spring 1969] raises the question, "Might we not be better advised to speak out as a church and as individual Christians more forthrightly than we have against the horrors and futility of war?" This temptation is doubly strong in a war which has been prosecuted from the start on the basis of a policy of seeming no-winmanship.

Nevertheless this is to express the hope that we will continue to reject the counsel to "speak out." For one thing, we never have declared or inveighed against war. It is to be fervently hoped that we will continue to measure up to the tallness of our historical posture on war and also keep faith with the trailblazing heroism of Desmond Doss, who proclaimed to the world that we are really "conscientious cooperators."

This is not to say that war is ever a desirable end in itself. But it is to say that when the only other alternative is tyranny, war is infinitely to be desired above submitting in craven supinity, and [it is] to deny the pseudo doctrine that war is sin. It is never for the church to pass this judgment.

It is for us to remember that neither the state nor the church is mandated by God to an anti-war position. Defense is one of the very first responsibilities of the state as [declared] in our Constitution, and the church will do well to refrain from any and every attempt to tell the state how, if for no other reason than that defense is none of the church's business.

The Christian patriot's individual support of the "selective war" strategy, if he must, is strictly his own business. Anderson disposed of this curious notion with consummate finality, and he is to be congratulated for his customary incisive succinctness.

There is a further perplexity at the close of Anderson's letter. It resides in his statement that it is the "chief objective of the church to mediate the love of God to all men everywhere." If he is paraphrasing Jesus' commission to go into all the world to teach and bear witness, fine. This is crystal clear. But if he is suggesting that Christ has or needs assistant mediators, this is something else. And it must be asked, "Where is such instruction to be found in the Holy Book?"

DONALD F. HAYNES
Glendale, California

I have read with interest the trilogy on "The Christian and War" [Winter 1969]. Of particular interest was Chuck Scriven's "The Case For Selective Nonpacifism."

No more just war can be found than one in which the Christian is fighting under Christ's personal command. Yet under just such a circumstance Christ declared: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants [Christians] fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John 18:36). No, Christians are not justified in fighting (bearing arms for the purpose of killing) — much less killing — even in "just" wars.

What is more astounding is the author's attempt — for that is all it turns out to be, an attempt — to justify killing by Christians in "just" wars on the basis of "agape, or Christian love." O *agape*! how many crimes are committed in thy name!

DONALD E. MANSELL
Washington, D. C.

Some modern theologians say God is dead. It appears that Ronald L. Numbers ["In Defense of Secular History," Spring 1969] thinks that the devil is dead too. At all events he finds little "available" evidence of "the influence of the divine and satanic forces" worthy of "inclusion" by "scholarly histories."

If George Edgar Shankel's *God and Man in History* overemphasizes divine and satanic influences in history, Numbers may be a wee bit inclined to underestimate such influences. Secularists and rationalists have always had their devotees. They are not absent today.

Although today's historians generally do not accept the Bible as history per se, they do recognize that it deals with causes and effects of events, "whether they be of a social, political, economic, or psychological nature."

From Genesis to Revelation the Bible reveals that both God and Satan have been and still are influencing history. According to Numbers this is "divine revelation," and as such it "throws light on relatively few historical events." While it is true that Christian historians may differ as to the degree which this or that particular event unequivocally shows "providential action," it is going a bit far to infer that all bona fide historians will "refrain from [such] unsupported speculations."

The article by Numbers comes "dangerously close" (a phrase used by Numbers in describing one of Shankel's alleged aberrations) to being an exercise in the sort of intellectual agility which Paul described in 1 Corinthians 2. To Numbers' credit be it noted that he does "recognize the possible value of having an overall interpretation of history based on Christian beliefs." Overlooking non sequiturs and semantics often found in polemics, one may find that Numbers and Shankel are not so far apart after all. To Numbers "God's hand is invisible." To Shankel God's hand is both visible and invisible.

H. E. WESTERMEYER
Riverside, California

In terms of the Social Gospel Movement, which was in its heyday at the turn of this century, placing Doctor Kellogg and Adventism under this rubric gives a distorted impression [Richard W. Schwarz, "Adventism's Social Gospel Advocate, John Harvey Kellogg," Spring 1969]. This religious-historical phenomenon was promoted chiefly by liberal clerical leaders. These were social reformers in the broad sense, and some of their proposals border on out-and-out socialism. Doctor Kellogg and Adventism would make strange bedfellows with this group, at least from one important standpoint.

Social service or social welfare, which Doctor Kellogg practiced and which Adventists engage in on many fronts, is not the same as social action. Social action was an integral part of the social gospel. Social service seeks to lighten the burdens of the afflicted, whereas social action works to correct the causes of their suffering. Social service provides handouts and soup kitchens for the hungry and dispossessed. Social action attacks directly the evils of the society which make soup kitchens necessary.

Doctor Kellogg in his day, and our church then and now, have eschewed social action. The unswerving conviction that the overriding mission of the church is the proclamation of the everlasting gospel, distrust of big government, and the far right position of the church on the political/economic spectrum explain to a large degree its rejection of social action down to the present time.

In the final sentence of his well-researched study Doctor Schwarz introduces a corrective to the title of the article when he characterizes the Battle Creek health leader as "a practitioner of his interpretation of the social gospel." Doctor Kellogg apparently did not feel a concern or a compulsion for social action, as his remarks at Evanston in 1896 and on other occasions would indicate.

GODFREY T. ANDERSON
Loma Linda, California

If SPECTRUM is what I think it is to be, it will fill a very important place. I wouldn't spend money on a magazine that is mainly negative. But if it will study Adventist teachings and policies in depth, if it will be constructive, I am all for it. I feel that the Adventist Church should be not only the pilgrim church, or the teaching church; it should also be the learning church.

I would like to see us study some doctrines we Adventists haven't studied very much. I would mention for one, Luther's great doctrine, universal priesthood of believers. I would like to see a study on conscience. What is its relation to Christian living? And how does one come by a good, reliable conscience?

A. J. MEIKLEJOHN
Denver, Colorado

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

RICHARD HAMMILL (*The Church Does Need a Law School*) earned the bachelor of arts degree from Walla Walla College, the master of arts (biblical languages) from Andrews University Theological Seminary (1947), and the doctor of philosophy (Hebrew history and culture) from the University of Chicago (1950). Formerly associate secretary of the department of education of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Doctor Hammill has been president of Andrews University since 1963.

JAMES J. LONDIS (*The Silent Word*), assistant professor of religion at Atlantic Union College, has a bachelor of arts degree from Atlantic Union College (1960) and a master of arts from Andrews University (1962). He is studying at Boston University for a doctorate in philosophy of religion.

EARLE HILGERT (*Theological Dimensions of the Christian Doctrine of Creation*), professor of New Testament at Andrews University, holds the bachelor of arts and bachelor of theology degrees from Walla Walla College (1945), the master of arts and bachelor of divinity from Andrews University (1946, 1955), and the doctor of theology from the University of Basel (1962). He has written journal articles and a book, *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament*, and he has been a member of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches since 1967.

ALVIN L. KWIRAM (*The Occupation of University Hall*) has bachelor's degrees (both arts and science) from Walla Walla College (1958) and earned the doctor of philosophy from California Institute of Technology (1963). He has been A. A.

If SPECTRUM is what I think it is to be, it will fill a very important place. I wouldn't spend money on a magazine that is mainly negative. But if it will study Adventist teachings and policies in depth, if it will be constructive, I am all for it. I feel that the Adventist Church should be not only the pilgrim church, or the teaching church; it should also be the learning church.

I would like to see us study some doctrines we Adventists haven't studied very much. I would mention for one, Luther's great doctrine, universal priesthood of believers. I would like to see a study on conscience. What is its relation to Christian living? And how does one come by a good, reliable conscience?

A. J. MEIKLEJOHN
Denver, Colorado

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

RICHARD HAMMILL (*The Church Does Need a Law School*) earned the bachelor of arts degree from Walla Walla College, the master of arts (biblical languages) from Andrews University Theological Seminary (1947), and the doctor of philosophy (Hebrew history and culture) from the University of Chicago (1950). Formerly associate secretary of the department of education of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Doctor Hammill has been president of Andrews University since 1963.

JAMES J. LONDIS (*The Silent Word*), assistant professor of religion at Atlantic Union College, has a bachelor of arts degree from Atlantic Union College (1960) and a master of arts from Andrews University (1962). He is studying at Boston University for a doctorate in philosophy of religion.

EARLE HILGERT (*Theological Dimensions of the Christian Doctrine of Creation*), professor of New Testament at Andrews University, holds the bachelor of arts and bachelor of theology degrees from Walla Walla College (1945), the master of arts and bachelor of divinity from Andrews University (1946, 1955), and the doctor of theology from the University of Basel (1962). He has written journal articles and a book, *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament*, and he has been a member of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches since 1967.

ALVIN L. KWIRAM (*The Occupation of University Hall*) has bachelor's degrees (both arts and science) from Walla Walla College (1958) and earned the doctor of philosophy from California Institute of Technology (1963). He has been A. A.

Noyes instructor and research fellow at Caltech, has held a postdoctoral appointment in physics at Stanford University, and since 1965 has been lecturer in chemical physics at Harvard University. Doctor Kwiram is one of those who helped establish the Association of Adventist Forums and is in his second year as president. (See also Winter 1969.)

DONALD E. HALL (*On Being a Seven-Day Scientist*) is a graduate of Southern Missionary College (bachelor of arts 1961) and has the master of science and doctor of philosophy degrees from Stanford University (1964, 1968). An assistant professor of physics at Walla Walla College, he has special interests in plasma astrophysics and, on the side, in the discussion of science and religion.

GREGORY R. WISE (*Götterdämmerung*) holds a bachelor of arts degree from Johns Hopkins University (1967) and a master of arts from Loma Linda University (1969). He is a freshman medical student this year at the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara in Mexico.

VICTOR A. HERVIG (*Operation Dare*) is a senior student at Loma Linda University pursuing studies for a major in physics in the College of Arts and Sciences. He is interested in computers and flying, and he has a private pilot's license.

WILFRED M. HILLOCK (*Tuition Rates in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges*) is assistant professor of accounting and management at Loma Linda University. He holds the bachelor of science degree from the University (1959) and the master of business administration from Indiana University (1960). He served a period in India as secretary-treasurer of the Western India Union.

M. JERRY DAVIS (*The Puritans and the Sabbath*) is associate minister of the White Memorial Church in Los Angeles. He earned the bachelor of arts degree from Loma Linda University (1960), the master of arts and bachelor of divinity from Andrews University (1962, 1963), and the doctor of religion from the Claremont (California) School of Theology (1967). He is especially interested in the American church and in American family life.

KENNETH R. MACKINTOSH (*The Peaceable Kingdom*) attended the Art Center College of Design from 1956 to 1958 and earned the master of fine arts degree from Otis Art Institute, Los Angeles, in 1961. He is associate professor of art at Walla Walla College and chairman of the department.

CHARLES W. TEEL, JR. (*The Mennonites and Social Responsibility*) is a candidate for the doctor of philosophy degree at Boston University and for the master of theology at Harvard University. He earned the master of arts (systematic theology) at Andrews University. Before that, he was teacher and pastor at Newbury Park Academy for four years. His special interests are sociology of religion, social ethics, and the church and society.

ARTHUR HAUCK (*The Ultimate Concern?*) has taught at Union College since 1955. He is associate professor of speech and chairman of the department. He holds the bachelor of arts degree from Union College (1950) and the master of arts from the University of Colorado (1959). He has been working on requirements for the doctor of philosophy at the University of Minnesota.

R. EDWARD JOHNSON (*A Story of Friendship*) is a ministerial intern in Southern California. He earned the bachelor of arts degree from Loma Linda University (1967) and the bachelor of divinity from Andrews University (1969).

PAUL O. CAMPBELL (*How Can Man Find God?*) is assistant professor of speech at Loma Linda University and a member of the staff of the Glendale city church. He holds the bachelor of arts degree from Pacific Union College (1950) and the master of arts from Pepperdine College (1960), and he has taken further graduate study at the University of Southern California.

LLOYD BAUM (*Comparative Odontology*) is chairman of the department of restorative dentistry at Loma Linda University School of Dentistry. He earned the doctor of dental medicine degree at the University of Oregon (1946) and the master of science at the University of Michigan (1952). He is active in professional organizations and in writing for professional journals. Recently he has served as chairman of the research committee of the American Academy of Gold Foil Operators.

HERSCHEL HUGHES (*Hunger*) and DIRK KOOPMANS (*Sheaf*) have made contributions to earlier issues of SPECTRUM. (See Winter and Spring issues.)