ON THE IMPORTANCE OF WORSHIP

by Bruce Braman

The Christian faith requires conduits of an adequate theology, an adequate liturgy and an adequate symbolism of worship. These forms are always in danger of becoming empty and require periodic protests against "devotion's every grace except the heart." But religious spontaneity without adequate forms degenerates into something even more graceless than a graceless formalism.

In the worship of the Church, as in every human action, we must establish certain priorities without which we shall be unable to sift the several claims upon divine service. The claims often afford divergent and mutually exclusive demands upon the worshipping community and therefore cannot profitably be allowed to exist side by side. The Church is constantly called to exercise careful discrimination in the ordering of its worship to the end that the basic priorities might always act as controls upon divine service.

That priority which the Church of Jesus Christ must always see as basic can best be stated perhaps in the very words of our Lord: "Not what I will, but what thou wilt." If we can agree that corporate worship is part of the service required of the Church by our Lord, then we ought also to be able to agree that the most basic criterion in our ordering of Christian worship must be derived from our knowledge of God and of what He requires of those who are His. Professor Bromiley, in making this same point, makes the distinction between anthropocentric and theocentric demands upon worship.

Yet regrettfully, it seems that all too often the causes which underlie our practiced patterns of worship have anthropocentric origins: we enjoy a good songfest; we seek to be "blessed;" we covet familiarity for its own sake ("The good old hymns of the faith" or as they have been otherwise described "The Top Twenty"); we want to give a solid testimony for our Lord; et cetera. Now, who is to disparage the individual's need for blessing or, for that matter, his need for a certain ease in worship produced through familiarity! Certainly not I! But this is not the point. It is rather that we cannot allow these anthropocentric requisites in themselves to order worship -- for then, in a certain sense, we have something which is other than Christian worship. Conceivably, these same factors could be used by Vietnamese monks to order worship in the Buddhist temples. In adopting an anthropocentric approach we depart from the theocentric and forfeit the claim to that which makes Christian worship Christian. We fall, as it were, into a theological illiteracy!
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UNITY THROUGH DIVERSITY

Theological education does not merely involve training in several practical or academic areas or merely technical equipping for a teaching or pastoral ministry. Important as these things might be, true theological education involves much more. It involves developing sensitivity to the vital qualities of Christian life: to truth, beauty, justice, holiness, humility and love.

This sensitivity to life is essentially derived from the Christian community as we share with each other the fruit of our own experience and growth. In fact, this is what distinguishes Christian "togetherness" from non-Christian: a common participation in the Spirit that allows the Christian to integrate all of life in a meaningful and wise way. A Seminary should be a "school" for Gemeinsames Leben. It is here that we should learn and experience, in theory and in practice, the principles which underlie a true communion of saints.

But how can we develop a sensitivity to and a greater understanding of the qualities of Christian life mentioned above? How is the Christian community able to help us at this point? We may ask this question in another way. What do we have available in our Seminary community in addition to our formal curriculum that can help us to become educated in the broadest sense?

One of the distinctives of Fuller is the diversity of backgrounds represented by both students and faculty. The great diversity of denominational and educational background offers a rich source for educational growth, but only if this diversity is exploited. It is unfortunate but true that in the past the various backgrounds of those represented at Fuller—in literature, art, music, drama, philosophy, science, history, and (alas for Fuller Seminary) even psychology—have not been used effectively to aid the intellectual and spiritual growth of the Seminary family.

In order to stimulate thought and action concerning these things, I would like to make several suggestions:

1. For the purpose of exploiting the diversity represented at Fuller, informal societies could be established in which students could meet together to exchange and develop ideas in both academic and non-academic areas (e.g. societies to promote work in literature, music, philosophy, drama, and various aspects of social work). These societies should be primarily involved in exchange of ideas, seeking to relate these areas of personal interest to our classroom study.

2. The responsibility for the growth and support of these kinds of activities lies with both students and faculty. The realization that a theological education is not limited to the classroom alone, should spur both students and faculty to consider their responsibility to the wider educational purpose of Fuller.

3. Unity through diversity can only come as the activities of these special interest groups are made to feed back into the whole seminary community. Such activities exist not for their own ends, but for the benefit of the entire community.

Ideally, we at Fuller represent both a community of scholars and a community of saints. The validity of our association together, as St. Paul points out (I Cor. 12), lies in the effectiveness with which we are able both to protect and integrate the diversity that exists among us.
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Our responsibility, then, is to the ordering of worship on theologically mature grounds. While our human needs cannot and ought not to be fully discounted, neither can these be allowed to interfere with that basic need to fulfill our duty of worship to God. Further, both the need and the duty of worship, in the heart of those who truly love God, are transformed into acts of love and joy.

What does this theocentric ordering of worship entail? First, there is the awakened awareness of the divine aspect of worship.

It is God's presence, ever seeking communion with His creatures, ever available to those who seek Him, that sustains our perfect worship. . . . Hence our worship of Him is best described in terms of our response—the response of creatures to their Maker, the response of sinners to their Redeemer.

Second, worship should issue forth in acts of adoration and of praise. Because God is who he is, it is worthy of our faint echoes of the offering of the angels: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of thy glory." And in a sense, all of worship is adoration, for it is intended to the glory of God: the reading of Holy Scriptures; the recitation of the Creeds; the offering up of our prayers. And what higher criterion for sacred song than adoration and praise?

We, too, / "with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven" presume to lift our hearts to join in heaven's praises. For though we are sinners, unworthy of that company, "we have an advocate with the Father." By His Ascension our Lord and Saviour has taken our humanity into heaven itself, "now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24). Because He makes us one with Him, we have access to God. Through Him we have a share in the glory that He offers to the Father eternally, throughout all ages and world without end.

Third, worship necessarily involves the obedient act of penitence. What was the first response of the prophet Isaiah to his vision of the Lord high and lifted up but penitence! "Woe is me! For I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips." We come to worship in all our frailness, in our sinfulness. We come as ones unfaithful—and 'faith' is a word of dual significance.

Faith is clearly divisible into two great virtues, belief (faith, strictly speaking) and fidelity. Shortcomings in relation to belief usually fall into the category of heresy, shortcomings in relation to fidelity usually fall into the category of sin.

And, because we recognize our unfaithfulness, we begin again our prayer of penitence. We do not presume to come before God in worship trusting in our own righteousness but rather in God's 'manifold and great mercies.' That is, we come penitent, confessing our sins and wickedness which still has power over the very fabric of our being.

It must further be noted that Isaiah's awareness was not merely his own sin but also of that of those about him; for he confessed also that he dwelt 'in the midst of a people of unclean lips.' In the same manner, confession has a corporate nature. The Church met together confesses her sin, her failures, her pride. Confession belongs to 'common worship.' We would, in the words of the poet George Herbert, 'fain go in' and indeed we ought not except there be that promise, that understanding that 'Love bade me welcome.' God seeks and desires communion with his creatures!

Fourthly, an incontrovertible part of worship is the act of offering up intercessions and petitions. Both intercession and petition have been rejected by some as would-be magical tools whereby finite man attempts to harness and control infinite.
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God. But such is a faulty piece of comparative religion. The position is clearly contrary to the teaching of Christ, especially as shown in the "Our Father." As Christians, we affirm that God wills for us to ask of his grace and even waits for our petitions and intercessions.

And the first petition which we must make is that we might be able to relate our requests to the perfect will and purposes of God. This is so because then our requests may be one with our adoration of God's will, and our prayers become a true part of Christian worship, being for the glory of God.

Lastly, worship may be understood as offering. All of worship may be understood in this way. Our prayers of petition and intercession are offering, especially when first we offer our imperfections to Him who is perfect that we and all others might be instruments of His will. Because of our faithlessness, we seek His forgiveness for not seeking His will and also for asking for those things which we ought not. In short, if our response to God in worship bears the marks of authenticity, then our adorations and penitence, our petitions and intercessions, are consummated in the offering of ourselves to Him by the help of His grace. We offer of our alms and oblations, our prayers, and ourselves humbly beseeching God to accept them, not because we chose to forfeit our offerings but rather that they might be entrusted again to us as we seek to bring glory to God.

2. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

SOME THOUGHTS ON CHAPEL AT FULLER

by F. Carlton Booth

Four times each week--Tuesday through Friday at 9:50 a.m., our Fuller Family meets for worship in what has been called for nearly 20 years a Chapel Service. I believe this mid-morning break can--and for most of us does--contribute something without which we would be spiritually impoverished.

Every family needs a time and place at least once a day where all the members may gather to see each other face-to-face, to relax and revel in the presence of one another and to have those family ties strengthened by such 'togetherness.' Without this, any family will disintegrate. Each will go his own way without regard for the others. Our Fuller Family is no exception. While here at Seminary we need each other. We cannot live in isolation and mature into strong Christian men and women. Whatever else the figure of the body of Christ may symbolize, one thing is certain; it points up the unity that exists between Christians. We need each other and perhaps we are never more conscious of this than when we assemble as a body for worship at 9:50 in the morning. We come primarily to worship Almighty God through the hymns
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SOME THOUGHTS ON CHAPEL AT FULLER (continued)

we sing, the prayers that are offered, the Scriptures that are read and whatever message may be brought by one of God's servants from time to time. And we tend to forget that our Heavenly Father is seeking worshippers (Jn. 4:23). In one translation this verse reads, "The Father is looking for such people to worship him," i.e. 'real worshippers' who worship 'in spirit and in truth'. When God comes looking for worshippers at Fuller Seminary at the hour of family worship each morning may He find us all present.

One student was asked "Are you coming to Chapel"? And his reply was, "Why should I, there's nothing in it for me." Such a confession is, among other things, a rather sad admission of spiritual immaturity. For if I go to chapel each day with a proper understanding of what the meeting is all about I realize that I go not only to receive a blessing, but to be a blessing.

Perhaps the 'order of service' today may not be tailored precisely to my liking, yet the person sitting beside me or in front of me or behind me may be having his need met in a most remarkable way. And therein I rejoice. And as the hymns are sung and the Word of God is read my heart ascends in the worship of God and I make my prayer—not so much for myself, as for my neighbor and for his need; and I find myself thanking God for answered prayer in many lives. Then tomorrow the various elements in the service may be exactly what my own soul requires; so I rejoice each day in the way the Holy Spirit meets the varied need represented by all the members of the Body of Christ which comprise our great Fuller Family.

However, I sense that it is possible to subscribe to all the above and yet lose the sense of expectancy and warmth in our chapel gathering. How easy it is to fall prey to habit. Spiritual things should be refreshing and invigorating. And I wonder, so far as our chapel is concerned, if we have operated too long in a rather tight mold of conformity without sufficient expectation or anticipation therefrom? Sometimes a mold can get moldy. Perhaps what we need is to break through the traditional formalism we have inherited in order to find renewal and freshness. One criticism has been that our chapels are too "speaker oriented". Perhaps we need to try something different. Have we smothered a spirit of freedom in worship, having taken from "the pews" and delegated to "the pros"? Is there a feeling that we are weighted with regimented ideas? What is the Holy Spirit saying to us?

The answer, in part, lies in flexibility and more freedom within our structure of worship. And a greater amount of congregational participation, it seems, is essential to our basic philosophy of Christian's individuality. In the life of the church the important thing is not structure or structures, but persons--persons who love one another. And experimentation with risk of failure is better than a futile attempt to justify a time honored structure or method or approach which may no longer meet the deepest need. Surely an active communicating God will show us the way and meet our needs if, in love for one another and openness to one another, we seek His will. Meanwhile "let us not forsake the assembling of ourselves together" (Heb. 10: 25).
CHAPEL: CRITICISM AND PROPOSAL
by Thomas F. Johnson

Chapel, as it was conducted last year, had no singular function in the life of the seminary. It was the handmaid of several purposes. The result was that the privilege of chapel was caused to be abused. This abuse and its causes are the subject of this brief essay. It is written, however, not as an exercise in retrospective criticism, but with the positive purpose of suggesting improvements for the chapel format for this year.

A regular feature of chapel was an "outside" speaker, i.e., an individual not formally connected with the seminary who at the behest of the chapel committee or some other official addressed those present. Ostensibly, these men were invited so that the student body might be privileged to hear and enjoy some of this nation's leading evangelicals. Also, some not-so-leading evangelicals were heard, as well as some not-so-evangelical leaders. All in all chapel was decidedly speaker-oriented.

Lest the issue be misrepresented, however, it must be said that there were those rare occasions when the seminary family was addressed by one of its own, and still more rare those which were designated "worship chapel," to distinguish them correctly from the usual kind of chapel. And then, there was the day of prayer.

Toward the end of the year, the inference was unavoidable that seminary public relations and recognition were a major consideration in the conduct of chapel. The student was bombarded with the names and claims of numerous organizations, all asking him just to "pray about it and if the Lord so leads, to join in a ministry to a quarter filled with a full program of academic studies, plus field work, plus family responsibilities, students usually struggle to find the time to maintain a sound devotional life, let alone give serious consideration to the claims of each of many organizations, rivals for student time and talent.

Furthermore, with the emphasis and focus on the various personalities who came to speak, chapel became an entertainment center. Students, for the most part, did or did not go to chapel on the basis of who was speaking. If the speaker's reputation or organization was promising of an interesting and enjoyable half-hour, attendance was good, and vice versa. Other students, not interested in hearing "great men on great themes," preferred to spend the chapel period in private devotions or over a cup of coffee in theological discussion.

The previous analysis suggests the following:

1. Students hear one lecture after another hour after hour every day - chapel should not just be another lecture period.
2. The function of chapel in the life of a seminary is to provide an opportunity for worship and the concentration of all our faculties on God. It is, as a result, an opportunity for spiritual refreshment.
3. It should not at all be a part of the purpose of chapel to promote public relations with various groups, churches, or organizations, or individuals. If the seminary's relations with the religious community at large are enhanced as a result, fine, but when chapel has outside speakers they should not be selected with a view to P.R.
4. Chapel attendance should not at all be required. What profit is there in compelling worship? If the motive behind such a move is to provide a large attendance for outside speakers, then again our emphasis is in the wrong place in ...
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CHAPEL: CRITICISM AND PROPOSAL (continued)

5. The only worthy reasons for having chapel are the worship and glory of God, and the growth in Christ of His people. If any other motive enters into the planning of chapels and their operation, it is improper. (Having speakers is not, per se, incompatible with such a view.)

6. The practice of drawing heavily on outside speakers deserves further study. If chapel is worship of God by His people, and is conducted for no other purpose, leading in worship is a privilege in which the student body and faculty could be fully participating. On these grounds, however, there would be no objection to local pastors, etc., leading chapel services as well.

7. Members of the chapel committee and others responsible for chapel services must think through the meaning of worship. What is it? How can it be structured (if it can or must)? What form or forms of worship best suit the day-to-day life of the seminary? Are we given any Biblical guidelines for the conduct of worship? What? Do they apply to our situation? How?

8. The time that chapel is held and its length deserve discussion. Why is chapel held at the time it is? Could it be more profitable held at some other hour?

9. We students make chapel what it is by what we demand of it and by the attitudes that we take to the service. More than once I have gone from a hidden desire to be entertained, or as a passive observer of a speaker, as a spectator, or critic. All such desires and attitudes are definitely wrong. This year we must demand more both of ourselves and of our chapel.

Note: This criticism applies to chapel as it was conducted last year, not as it functioned this summer. The latter was a step in the right direction. //\

* * *

A CONSERVATIVE VIEW OF THE MORAL LIMITS OF GOVERNMENT
by Thomas Talbott

It was Christian thinking, through Augustine, that gave the world the limited state. What an irony it would be if Christians, misled by secular utopian progressivism, should be among them that break down government's limitations!—Gerhart Niemeyer

In this essay I propose to discuss the moral limits of government, specifically, the moral limits of democracy. I shall divide the essay into four loosely related sections. In the first section I shall discuss the existing tension between justice and democracy, which discussion hopefully will dislodge from our minds certain naive assumptions about the intrinsic value of democracy. In the second section I shall attempt to identify the moral presupposition of all opposition to slavery. In the third section I shall suggest that the moral intuition which leads one to regard slavery as evil ought to lead him to regard all coercion as evil, and it is in this context that I shall discuss the problem of the justification and limits of government. The final section will be rather broad, touching on a variety of subjects, and it will therefore lack somewhat in precision. I include it primarily to stimulate discussion.
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A CONSERVATIVE VIEW OF THE MORAL LIMITS OF GOVERNMENT (continued)

Since ours is a nation in which the one man one vote principle has become an accepted political axiom, and the ideal of universal suffrage a widely acclaimed sine qua non for the just society, the question of the moral limits of government can in part be interpreted as the question of the moral limits of majority rule. The fundamental question is this: Are there times when the will of the majority ought to be restrained? If the current racial crisis has done nothing else, it has illustrated the manner in which democracy and justice tend to war against one another, for in almost every instance the Negro has been granted equality before the law against the will of his neighbors. It is Governor Wallace, not Martin Luther King, who is seeking to practice democracy in Alabama, and there was probably nothing more undemocratic in the history of our nation than Abraham Lincoln's proposal to emancipate the slaves. This is a point which seems to have become completely lost on the American public. Mr. Lincoln was not fighting for democracy. On the contrary, he was seeking to limit democratic rule by certain moral restrictions against which no man has the right to cast a ballot. His language often reveals a deep-rooted contempt for absolute democracy. "Frank Blair and Gratz Brown tried to get up a system of gradual emancipation in Missouri, had an election in August, and got beat; and you, Mr. Democrat, threw up your hat and hallowed, 'Hurrah for democracy!'" Contending that questions of morality are not properly resolved at the ballot box, Mr. Lincoln argued in his famous debate with Judge Douglas that slavery is either an evil or it is not. If it is an evil, then no one has the right to vote in its favor; and if no one has the right to vote in its favor, the just state will not provide anyone such political privilege. Therefore, one who argues that the question of slavery is justly left to the democratic process of the slave states commits himself, either knowingly or unknowingly, to the proposition that slavery is not an evil.

When Judge Douglas says that whoever or whatever community wants slaves, they have the right to have them, he is perfectly logical if there is nothing wrong with the institution; but if you admit that it is wrong, he cannot logically say that anyone has the right to do wrong...so that...in all the arguments sustaining the Democratic policy, there is a careful, studied exclusion of the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery.

Such an argument seems straightforward enough, but it is inimical to modern democratic assumptions. On his weekly television program, The Firing Line, William F. Buckley, Jr. has horrified several opponents by constructing a parallel argument—only Mr. Buckley's argument involves communism. Communism, says Mr. Buckley, is an evil; it is an evil because it violates the rights of those whom it holds captive. Therefore, no man, whether he lives in Saigon or Los Angeles, has the right to vote for a communist state. To the modern mind this is pure heresy, but it should be noted that to the southern mind Mr. Lincoln's argument was also pure heresy. And it should also be noted that precisely the same logical structure underlies both arguments. If x is evil, no one has the right to vote for x; from which it follows: if anyone has the right to vote for x, x is not evil; from which it follows: if anyone believes that anyone has the right to vote for x, he commits himself to the view that x is not evil. Now if we place Mr. Buckley's argument along side Mr. Lincoln's, and if we assume that slavery is an evil, we are forced to choose one of three alternatives: (a) communism is not an evil, (b) communism is an evil and no one has the CONTINUED ON PAGE 9
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right to vote for communism, or (c) Mr. Lincoln's argument that no one has the right
to vote for slavery is unsound. Let it be observed that (a), (b), and (c) form a
complete disjunction; they exhaust the logical possibilities. They also reveal why
the Liberal attitude toward communism is of some concern to conservatives. If it is
proper to outlaw slavery in the name of human rights, why is it not proper to outlaw
communism in the name of those same human rights?—and if the Liberal favors the
thirteenth amendment even though it removes one's privilege of voting for slavery,
why does he so frantically oppose such a measure as the 1954 Communist Control Act on
the ground that it virtually removes one's privilege of voting for communism? I
shall not draw the logical conclusion.

If we are to have a genuine discussion, we must find a common ground, a point of
agreement. Since few of us would deny that slavery is an evil, the slavery issue is
a profitable starting point for analysis.

That slavery ought not to be implies that man ought to be free, and that man
ought to be free seems to imply that man possesses an inalienable right of natural
liberty. The second inference may not follow logically (i.e. analytically), but I
have yet to hear a satisfactory alternative. Inalienable rights are not, of course,
self-evident truths if by 'self-evident' one means 'capable of rational demonstration.'
Discovered by intuition, they can be denied without contradiction, but such denial
carries implications; and if one finds that the implications of the denial of an
alleged right are unacceptable, he commits himself to the existence of that right.
If, for example, one denies the right of natural liberty, or that it applies to all
men equally, he commits himself to the following disjunction: either (a) there is
some other moral basis for opposing slavery, or (b) there is some non-moral basis
for opposing slavery, or (c) there is no basis for opposing slavery. Now if one
intuitively feels that slavery is evil, and if he finds (a), (b), and (c) untenable,
he joins me in opting for the inalienable right of natural liberty; but if he finds
(a), (b), or (c) acceptable, I invite him to defend his thesis and thereby prolong
the dialogue.

Assuming that the right of natural liberty is inalienable, we must now add pre­
cision to our discussion by making the meaning of liberty more explicit. Liberty is
simply the absence of coercion, a concrete expression of human will unimpeded by the
restrictions of external force. A man's right to express himself freely is inalien­
able, and any violation of this right is by definition evil. Moreover, since the
functions of government are necessarily coercive, it follows, again by definition,
that government is evil. Force of any kind, however good the intentions of those
exerting it, is a violation of human dignity, an affront to the divine image in man.
Those progressives who advocated protecting children from all forms of parental
interference stood on solid ground, a clear intuition of the evil nature of force,
and it is partly on this ground that I stood when I became a registered conscientious
objector. But I erred, even as the progressives erred, by my failure to take seri­
ously the Christian doctrine of original corruption. Every man has the right to be
free, but no man has the right to murder, steal, hold slaves, or in any way violate
the rights of another, and this is precisely what sinful man does. Sinful man ren­
ders society and anarchy incompatible, and anarchy intolerable, and as a fallen
creature, he now faces a tragic moral situation. The question is no longer one of
using force or not using force. It is the more complex one of whether a state of
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society is better (i.e. less evil) than a state of anarchy. When a pacifist argues
that certain forms of violence are never justified, he argues in effect that a state
of society is not worth these forms of violence, that if a state of society requires
these forms of violence, anarchy is better. This places the issue in a different
perspective. In the real world of flesh and blood, a government which does not co-
erce, simply, does not govern. Coercion is evil, but the alternative to govern-
mental coercion (i.e. anarchy) is a worse evil. Government, then, is a necessary
evil, and therein lies its justification. One could build a good case for pacifism
in heaven, but earth requires government, and government is, in the words of Gordon
Clark, both "a partial punishment and cure for sin."5

Since society is better than anarchy, and since society requires government, the
state is morally justified; but there comes a point when a state sacrifices its
right to exist. To define that point precisely is impossible, but as the state pro-
gresses toward absolute tyranny, it reaches a point where the evil it perpetuates is
greater than the evil of anarchy. When this point is reached, the citizen must do
everything in his power to bring the state down, for it no longer deserves to exist.
Only necessary evils are justified evils, and, therefore, only those governmental
functions rendered necessary by human sinfulness are justified functions. These
functions are, I think, self preservation, the maintenance of law and order, and the
preservation of justice. A state cannot even exist without doing some violence to
the liberty of its citizens, but in so far as it limits the exercise of its power to
the performance of its proper functions, it maintains its right of existence; and
whatsoever liberties it deems necessary to violate in order to perform these func-
tions, these liberties it properly violates.6 But if it arrogates to itself more
power, if it manipulates the lives of its citizens in matters of private concern, it
violates the very reason of its existence which is the protection of its citizens
from evil.

At this point we must avoid a common confusion. During the 1964 election cam-
paign one of Walter Lippmann's favorite criticisms of Barry Goldwater was that Mr.
Goldwater's desire for strong military and police forces is inconsistent with his
attack on big government. But this is fantastic! Mr. Goldwater sought limited
government, not weak government. Weak government is clearly bad government as the
failure of the Articles of Confederation proved. A just state must possess suffi-
cient power to perform its proper functions (i.e. those functions rendered necessary
by original sin), but it will also limit the exercise of its power to those functions.
To confuse limited government with weak government is unfortunately typical of the
shoddy thinking we have come to expect from Mr. Lippmann.

The general suspicion of government which conservatives share with classical
liberals is a valuable safeguard against tyranny. John Stuart Mill observed that
"there is...in the world at large an increasing inclination to stretch unduly the
powers of society over the individual, both by the force of opinion and even by that
of legislation," and this inclination tends "to grow more and more formidable."7
Poverty and welfare programs in particular tend to leave government towering over
the individual. The conservative does not oppose every welfare program on principle,
but he does oppose the "welfare mentality." He recognizes that welfare, although
possibly necessary as a last resort in cases of very extreme poverty, does not
remove the economic problem underlying poverty, but only perpetuates it. We are not
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here speaking of the important fact that men are by nature lazy, but of the economic
axiom that in the final course of events there is but one way of solving economic
problems; namely, submission to the demands of the market. However, immediate
economic solutions are not always desirable, and this is where the classical liber­
als make their mistake. Despite his brilliance as an economist, Ludwig von Mises,
for example, fails to consider adequately the devastating effect radical change can
have on the human personality. Left unhampered, the free market would quickly solve
the farm problem, but the manner of its solution some would deem inhuman. Having
recently moved into a new apartment, I was struck by the way in which my son clung
to familiar objects. His bed, his ball, and his little chair all acquired new
significance in the unfamiliar surroundings. They were symbols of the old life in
the old apartment, and they gave a meaningful continuity to his life. Men are
creatures of habit, and they love the familiar, and change, if it is too radical,
can completely disrupt a man's life. This, I take it, is the rationale behind farm
subsidies, and the conservative with his aversion to disruptive change is sympathe­
ic. But the conservative is also a realist, recognizing that economic problems
demand an ultimate solution. He not only objects to the unethical extension of the
powers of the state, but also to the tenacious rigidity with which modern Liberals
resist almost all economic changes; and he views interventionism in general, and
massive welfare and poverty programs in particular, as an indication of the Liberal's
basic unwillingness to submit to the demands of the market. The Liberal has, in
effect, taken a flight from reality, and in his attempt to defeat the market he
continues to place tyrannical power in the hands of the government, stifling individ­
ual initiative, and rendering the ideal of John Stuart Mill forever unattainable.

A government cannot have too much of the kind of activity which
does not impede, but aides and stimulates, individual exertion and
development. The mischief begins when, instead of calling forth the
activity and powers of individuals and bodies, it substitutes its own
activity for theirs; when, instead of informing, advising, and, upon
occasion, denouncing, it makes them work in fetters, or bids them
stand aside and does their work instead of them. The worth of a State,
in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it; and a
State which postpones the interests of their mental expansion and
elevation, to a little more of administrative skill,...a State which
dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments
in its hands even for beneficial purposes--will find that with
small men no great thing can be accomplished; and that the perfection
of machinery to which it has sacrificed everything, will in the end
avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that
the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.8

1. "Toward Totalitarian Simplicity?" The Intercollegiate Review, Vol. 2, No. 3,
p. 175.
3. Ibid., p. 189.
4. We are not here discussing the practical problem of order. One might argue from
prudence that the state should grant its citizens the political privilege of
voting for x. Nevertheless, the citizen has no moral ground for demanding this
privilege in the name of justice, and ideally, he would never have this privi­
lege.
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6. Thus, there are circumstances under which the state properly violates the liberties of murderers, communists, or anyone seeking to trample under foot the rights of others. One of the functions of HUAC is to provide information as to just what liberties the state properly violates.
8. Ibid., p. 117-118.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

CAESAR AND GOD

The Los Angeles Times for Tuesday morning, September 20, 1966, carried two front page headlines. One referred to Senator Dirksen's having killed the civil rights bill in the Senate (with the help of fellow Republicans and Southern Democrats), while the other announced that the same Senator was reopening his battle for a prayer amendment to the Constitution.

WHEREAS Fuller Seminary is an evangelical seminary, and WHEREAS the National Association of Evangelicals has been more articulate in calling for prayer in school than for fair housing after school, and WHEREAS Christianity Today, which evangelicals read, seems to have overlooked the following item occurring in The Congressional Record for March 22, 1966;

THEREFORE I have resolved that readers of the opinion, being themselves fledgling theologs, should read part of Mr. Dirksen's argument for the prayer amendment on the floor of the Senate, an argument which illumines the profundity of his Christian insight.

I add a few personal thoughts. A thousand years before the Galilean was born—yes, and perhaps several thousand years—the original parents were warned about the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." They were warned only that to touch it or eat of the fruit meant death. But the tempter serpent beguiled Eve, and she took of the fruit and shared it with Adam. There was no compulsion. There was complete freedom of choice and, having chosen, they must bear the consequences. This, then is the foundation for the whole doctrine of vicarious atonement. This freedom of choice not only in the spiritual but the material world as well has been aroding and with it come the vexations, the frustrations, and the desperations which mark the lives of so many.

Men look to a God for comfort, for solace, for consolation, for guidance, and for hope. Glibly and superficially, it is argued that the place for this is the church which children attend once or twice each week, or in the home where the preschool hours are given to preparing for school, the after-school hours in unleashing youthful energy, and the early pre-retirement hours with books and television and the other diversions of the day.

The really alert hours—perhaps 6 or 7—are spent in school. These are the formative years for 50 million youngsters. These are the hours when the habit of prayer can best be nurtured.

Prayer is the roadmap to God. It should become the greatest adventure for young minds. Each must find the way for himself. This takes some doing—the development of right habits, the building
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of spiritual muscle. This can come only from practice and rehearsal day
after day when young minds are alert.

How strange that we spend hundreds of millions of public funds
every year to develop physical fitness and harden the muscles of
American youth, but when it comes to hardening the spiritual muscles
through the practice and rehearsal of prayer, it becomes enshrouded
in quaint legalism and the jargon of church and state.

Mr. President, I finish by saying: Give Caesar what he requires,
but give God a little also.

Speaking of giving God a little, if my memory does not fail me, not so long ago
Senator Dirksen made an effort to have Congress place elections on Sunday, a day
which the ancient Christians called the "Lord's Day."

Dr. Paul King Jewett
Professor of Systematic Theology

Beginning with this issue, the opinion will initiate a new feature: a monthly
bibliography of recent faculty publications. The editors of the opinion feel that
there are numerous articles and book reviews written by the faculty that go unread
by Fuller students simply because most students are unaware of what has been written.
In order to stimulate interest among students and faculty concerning faculty publi­
cations, the opinion will publish monthly a bibliography of faculty publications
which appeared the preceeding month. So that we may catch up with past material,
this issue covers material written during the past several months.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dr. James Daane, Professor of Pastoral Theology: "Protestantism in Transition",
September 2, 1966; "Worship in the Reformed Tradition", August 19, 1966;
Atheism", June, 24, 1966; "Baptism Today and Tomorrow", June 10, 1966; "Freedom
"Reformed Dogmatics", February 18, 1966; "Sacred and Secular", February 4, 1966,
(the above are all found in Christianity Today); "Christianity and History",

Dr. Everett F. Harrison, Professor of New Testament: "Review of The Quest Through
34-35.

Dr. George E. Ladd, Professor of New Testament Theology and Exegesis: "Review of
"History and Theology in Biblical Exegesis", Interpretation, January, 1966,
pp. 54-64; "The Role of Jesus in Bultmann's Theology", Scottish Journal of
Theology, March, 1965, pp. 57-68.
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OF BELLS AND WORSHIP
by William Walker

Aye!
The bells peeled long and clear
Through the festering narrows
Of every conscience.

And the cause of Worship
Was again begun with vigor renewed
For those so desparately impoverished.

But lo!

Ancient Bell-Ringer
What of it?

Have your massy arms
E'en entered to light a candle
For your mother
Or God?

Has your spirit even soared in the realms
Of mystic communion
So ariel
And sweetly permeating?

Or
Has your heart been deafened
To all but that lusty ringing
Of your privileged preoccupation?

And the ancient ringer of bells was dumbfounded
by this singular impertinence.

For was he not the giant among bell-ringers in the land
And had he not devotedly immersed his life
In this most reverent of tasks?

For he uncommonly felt that God
Had bountifully blessed
His periodic peels to the public.

And his devotion to God
And his bells
Increased with each passing supplication.

Now the strange thing is

He was God's chosen Archangel
And was revered high and wide
for his devotion to worship.

* * * * *

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