

INTEGRITY is published each month and seeks to encourage all believers in Christ to strive to be one, to be pure, and to be honest and sincere in word and in deed, among themselves and toward all men.

Integrity

8494 Bush Hill Court
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Flint, Michigan 48501
Permit No. 239

JUNE 1976

Integrity

Editorial: A Good Show

About Heretics

W. Carl Ketcherside

How Could He Do That?

Help for Our Weakness

Hoy Ledbetter

The Devil's Advocate

Trust and the Struggle for Human Community

Steven Spidell

A Child's First Steps

Sheila Dalton

A GOOD SHOW (continued from page 2)

hurting bodies, our effort at formulating the correct approach to benevolence is a shallow exercise. And before we can convincingly persuade others of the terms of covenant relationship with God, we must know by joyful experience the meaning of our own agreement with him.

In a well-known passage (Amos 6), the prophet Amos pronounces woes to those "who are at ease in Zion." Yet nothing that those under his indictment are said to have enjoyed (beds of ivory, couches, lambs and calves to eat, songs, musical instruments, wine, and anointing oil) was wrong in itself, and in another generation such items could have been regarded as a sign of God's blessing. (We may compare our king-size beds, reclining rockers, filet

mignon, quadraphonic receivers, fine sauternes, and delicate colognes.) What was wrong was that their preoccupation with such luxuries could coexist with their indifference to "the ruin of Joseph."

It is quite possible for pleasure-loving materialists to observe the externals of religion very scrupulously, yet have no genuine concern for the poverty, pain, emptiness, lostness, and oppression of their neighbors. The challenge of turning such hearts to the Lord in true repentance has often been too much for the greatest prophets, yet, insofar as it is necessary, that must be the objective of reformers today, for unless our *why* is at least as good as our *how*, we are merely putting on a good show. —HL

Integrity

JUNE 1976

Volume 8
Number 1

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Hoy Ledbetter

EDITORIAL BOARD
David F. Graf
Joseph F. Jones
Dean A. Thoroman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

S. Scott Bartych
Bill Bowen
Dan G. Danner
Don Finto
Don Haymes
Maurice Haynes
Elton D. Higgs
W. Carl Ketcherside
John McRay
Norman L. Parks
Jim Reynolds
J. Harold Thomas

EDITORIAL ADDRESS
8494 Bush Hill Court
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Names may be added to our mailing list by writing to the editor. There is no subscription charge (we depend on contributions from readers and God's grace). However, contributions are necessary for our survival. Since we are approved by IRS, they are deductible.

BACK ISSUES: Available back issues can be obtained from Amos Ponder, 1269 Pickwick Place, Flint, MI 48507.

MANUSCRIPTS written exclusively for INTEGRITY are welcomed.

WARNING: Readers who fail to notify us of address changes (even very slight ones) will be dropped from our mailing list.

EDITORIAL

A GOOD SHOW

What is the best weapon with which to commit a murder? Mr. Hitchcock argues it is the icicle, because it melts and cannot be traced. And what is his interest in the subject? Surely it is not that he has homicidal tendencies; he just likes to put on a good show. Could it be that our interest in some of our religious discussions is not that they are of vital concern to us but that we just like to put on a good show?

One thing we have to watch out for today is that notion which the classical prophets of the Old Testament fought so unsuccessfully: that religious obligation can be discharged by busy religiosity. They failed, and catastrophe struck, because they could not bring about the inward changes in the hearts of the people upon which any lasting reform movement must be based. That we are interested in many aspects of religion is obvious, but that our hearts are right is not so certain. We might question ourselves as to whether we have too much concern with *how* and not enough with *why*. Preoccupation with externals is futile if we lack inward motivation.

For instance, we talk much about fellowship, but until we learn *to love* the brotherhood, methods of expressing brotherhood will remain subjects of purely academic discussion. It is useless to debate the nature of the various "offices" in the church if we have not heard the urgent call to ministry which makes certain functions inevitable. We deliberate in vain on the correct manner of serving and eating the Lord's supper when we simply do not recognize our fellow worshippers as temples in which the Lord is pleased to dwell, or lack the deep gratitude for his sacrifice which propels us to celebration.

Our polemics on methods of evangelization are mere buffeting of the air when we do not really believe in the power of the gospel or the lostness of our fellow men, or do not apply our chosen method out of a genuinely loving heart. In the absence of true Christian sympathy with broken and lonely hearts and

(continued on back cover)

ABOUT HERETICS

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

St. Louis, Missouri

All religious persecution is the same in the heart of the perpetrator. Only the methods change as mankind becomes more civilized. In one century the victims are tied to the stake, in another they are lied about in papers. The hangman's platform has surrendered to the harangue-man's pulpit, and since one man's apostasy is often another man's apostleship, we are frequently treated to a verbal barrage of accusations, innuendo and censure directed both ways and "always in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and to the glory of the Father," just as Torquemada carried on The Inquisition!

All legalistic systems are doomed to fragment into fighting factions. There is no escape. When men insist upon exercising their freedom to make their interpretation of revelation the authorized one, while denying the liberty to all others, they will split wide open every time someone learns a truth not previously discovered or discerned. Legalistic systems constantly breed "new messiahs" raised up to "save the brotherhood from digression" while gratifying the monumental ego of such modern saviors. Their chief stock in trade is the gall essential to thrusting themselves into situations which are not their concern, and of blowing issues up into gigantic proportions which, if left alone, would wither and die on the vine. All factionalists have to produce a red-hot issue, and if one gets a little cold they must reheat it or grab another out of the fire and wave it around!

There is one great difference between the persecution of yesterday and that of the present. The stern defenders of the

status quo in the yesteryear did not mess around with trivia. Their "heretics" were not dabblers in froth and fiddle-faddle. They were not blowing soap bubbles. They were involved in subjects like free will, foreordination, predestination, the nature of Godhood and sacramentalism. Being a heretic in those days was not a job for an amateur or a theological piddler. You had to really be up on what everyone else was down on! It required a smart man to be a heretic. There was no use of anyone else applying.

Heresy has been cheapened in our day by over-production. Almost everyone can be a heretic now and almost everyone is in the eyes of someone else. If you were to pool the attitudes of all the various partisans and accept their judgment as valid, there would not be a single follower of Jesus left on earth—only heretics and apostates! A man can become a heretic now by taking either side of such world-shaking issues as to whether or not a college girl can pray in a "rap session" where there are male collegians present. There is a world of difference between an Ultramontanist and a "one-copper" or between one who supported Monophysitism and one who sends a contribution to the Highland congregation in Abilene, Texas, to help pay the tariff on a radio and television program. Heretics are no longer big-name folks at all! They are as common as an old shoe.

In fact, the best way to become a heretic in one easy lesson is simply to unite with one of the two dozen groups wearing the denomination "Church of Christ." This will automatically make you an

Shall we continue to prate about a "pattern theology" when it has ripped us into shreds?

"apostate" to the other twenty-three segments. Even if you are quite ignorant of what the group with which you became identified "believes and teaches," the fact that you "took your stand" with them places you on the "black list" of the others and guarantees you will not be called on to publicly petition the Father of mercy if you attend their meetings. There are exceptions, of course, but you probably should not count on being one of them! You'll have enough disappointments as it is.

There is only one way to stop this consummate foolishness. It was recommended to Pharaoh by the God of Israel, but was conveyed through Moses, whom Pharaoh regarded as a heretic. *Let my people go!* The people of God belong to God. They are not pawns of preachers, nor pamperers of presbyters! They are not to be inhibited by institutions nor frightened by factions! It is time to acknowledge openly and frankly that we are not under law but under grace! The love letters of the new covenant scriptures are not a written code. Our pattern is a person. It is not a partisan practice

palmed off as the will of God. God's people do not need to be denounced from the pulpit but delivered from it. They need to be freed and not frightened, saved and not scared!

It is time to encourage brethren to think, not to punish them for doing so. Let mental torture and political reprisal be relegated to the Dark Ages and not practiced in the present day by those who profess to be followers of the Man of Nazareth. If this form of harassment must be perpetuated let it be characteristic of atheistic communism and not of the disciples of Him who lived and died to make us free. Shall we continue to defend a system which can only divide us out of existence as it has divided us out of influence in many places?

Shall we continue to prate about a "pattern theology" when it has ripped us into shreds, and each man quotes "book, chapter and verse" to sustain a different pattern? The pattern of the scriptures is universally to point to Jesus. He is the author and finisher of the faith! And His design is not to make great lawyers but grand lovers! Lord, teach us to love! □

HOW COULD HE DO THAT?

"Look, here's the man!"

"Crucify! Crucify!"

"You take him and crucify him. He's no criminal as far as I can see!"

"We have a Law, and according to that Law, he must die, for he made himself out to be the Son of God!"

How could he do that to us? No, I don't mean Pilate. I mean Jesus! He has taken away our beloved Law, and what do we have left? "Here's the man!" *The man!* We are shocked and scared and frustrated.

We no longer believe in the world which

God created. We no longer have faith in his creatures. We don't even trust ourselves. So we are uncomfortable when he comes too close to us. How can we trust a God who gets involved in this mess we call a world? It would be far better to have the Law—stern, unbending, aloof from corruption, and impervious to the wheedling of sinners.

If we are not to have the Law, but *a person*, then we must meet him either on our ground or on his. The former is unthinkable and . . . so is the latter. So the one thing we cannot forgive Jesus is his taking away of our Law—at least not until we learn to forgive ourselves.

HELP FOR OUR WEAKNESS

HOY LEDBETTER

It was Sunday morning in the small Ozark Mountain community. The visiting evangelist, song leader, and other Christians from the surrounding area who had come to establish a church in the old school house were gone, and for the first time the infant congregation was alone. None of the two or three men present was willing to lead the service, and, since the more talented women were not permitted to speak, the responsibility for conducting the worship fell into the hands of three teenage boys.

The youthful song leader struggled through three songs from the ragged paperbacks the missionaries had left behind and decided it was time for a prayer. He asked, "Who can lead a prayer?" Nobody answered. Then he appealed to the few prospects by name, but they all declined. There was an awkward pause. Finally someone looked out the window and saw an elderly brother slowly making his way down the road. "Here comes Will. Maybe he can lead a prayer." There was another long pause while the man of the hour trudged up the steps and appeared in the center aisle of the one-room school.

"Will, can you lead a prayer?"

"Naw, I can't lead nothin'" was the curt reply.

"Why, he can't even lead his old cow to water!" quipped a young voice.

When the snickers had died down, the nervous song leader rendered a welcome judgment: "Well, maybe we can just omit the prayer this morning."

I was there that day and, without ever having read Romans, I knew that "we do

not know how to pray as we ought." Of course, we were needlessly handicapped with the persuasion that prayer had to be in a language we did not speak and in a form which we did not understand. However, I soon found a solution that gave me more confidence than the circumstances warranted. An aunt (who could not speak for herself in the meetings) wrote out for me a prayer which I memorized, and for several weeks thereafter that prayer saved the day. Gradually I added a few touches of my own, and it no longer occurred to me that the weakness of which Paul spoke applied to me too.

When I was a baby preacher I encountered two brothers who illustrate some problems connected with prayer. One of these came to me in "my salad days, when I was green in judgment," and stated his problem. He said he *thought* prayers all the time, but he just could not say them out loud. It was my opinion at the time that valid prayers had to be vocalized, and I probably injured him by insisting that he learn to pray aloud, which, as far as I know, he never did.

The other brother was one whose reputation had preceded him to a meeting in which I was engaged in a rural community. As he expected to be, he was called upon to pray, and he did so with gusto. Actually it was more of a parade than a prayer. He began with a five-minute description of the beautiful sunset and then went on and on and on. It might have made a great serial, but since it was longer than the sermon, most of the congregation could not endure to the end. Later I

Can one be a Christian if he fails to commune with God on the most fundamental level?

wished I had had the courage of Dwight Moody and suggested, "While the brother finishes his prayer let's stand and sing number 47."

Now which of these two did the will of his Father? Back then I would have said neither (although I would have been careful where I said it), for I felt the first was only praying to himself and the second was merely praying to the audience. But now my judgment is more generous, and I would like to tell you why.

During the past few weeks some of the finest Christians I know have commented in my presence about how incapable they are of praying. It would be easy to dismiss such people's religion as hopelessly shallow, for can one be a Christian if he fails to relate to God on the most fundamental level? Since prayer is the most elementary expression of religion, must we not assume that anyone who has a grain of Christianity should be able to pray? But that would be a disastrous assumption, as we soon shall see.

It seems wise to inject here a warning that in prayer, as in so many other expressions of religion, we seem to have an undying tendency to lay upon ourselves greater burdens than we can bear. God anticipated this inclination among his people long before we came on the scene, and he has taken the necessary steps to assure that our intimate relationship with him will not be disrupted by our frailties. "Everything in religion that matters starts from God's side," as James S. Stewart insists, and this certainly includes prayer. Unless we have some serious doubts about God's ability to work within us, we are perhaps much more effective in praying than we think.

On the other hand, if we do doubt that we are succeeding in prayer, we need to be reassured with Paul's marvelous declaration in Romans 8:26-27: "Like-

wise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words. And he who searches the hearts of men knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God."

A careful reading of this passage will confirm C.H. Dodd's definition of prayer as "the divine in us appealing to the God above us." Prayer, after all, is not a matter of wheedling God or persuading him to be gracious to us. If it is really communion with him, it is the result of his activity within us. In accordance with Schleiermacher's definition of religion as absolute dependence, we may say that it is as impossible for us to pray by ourselves as it is for us to be saved by ourselves, no matter how gifted we may be in the use of our mother tongue.

The statement that "we do not know how to pray as we ought" applies to all of us; the problem is universal. Since Paul uses the first person ("we"), we must assume that even apostles are included with those who have a problem in praying. At the very rock bottom level of religion we find ourselves unable to cope with what is required of us. There is a vast difference between "ought" and "can." Nevertheless the situation is not hopeless, for "the Spirit helps us in our weakness."

The word "help" is an interesting one, and, although we must be careful not to make too much of Greek compounds, it is well to point out that Paul's original word is made up of the verb *lambanein*, "to take hold of," compounded with two prepositions, *sun*, "along with," and *anti*, "over against." The Spirit, we may say, takes hold of our burden along with us and over on the opposite end. It is as though we were trying to pick up a log that is too heavy for us to lift by our-

How many times does God save us from disaster by hearing the crux of our desires rather than what we actually say!

selves. The Spirit picks up the other end so that with his help we are able to carry what needs to be carried.

Our ignorance about how to pray as we ought may show up at any time. At one time we may be at an utter loss for words to express the heart's feelings; we can only groan. At another time we may think we know what we are saying, but still ask for the very opposite of what we need, in which case we win when we lose. As Shakespeare put it in another context, "We, ignorant of ourselves, beg often our own harms, which the wise powers deny us for our good; so find we profit by losing of our prayers." This was particularly true in the case of Augustine's mother, who, concerned about her son's spiritual life, devoutly prayed that he would not go to Rome, failing to foresee that there she would have what she desired most of all—his true conversion. God gave her what she really wanted by saying no to what she asked for. As Augustine puts it in his *Confessions*, "What was it, my God, that she sought from you with so many tears, except that you would not let me sail away. But in your deepest counsels you heard the crux of her desire: you had no care for what she then sought, so that you might do for me what she forever sought." How many times does God save us from disaster by hearing *the crux* of our desires rather than what we actually say!

The manner in which the Spirit helps us in our weakness is very fascinating: he intercedes for us "with sighs too deep for words." Be careful not to misread this sentence. The sighs are not our own (although we may indeed sigh), but they are the Spirit's. These sighs cannot be put into words—surely the Spirit is not inarticulate!—for there are no words to convey their meaning. It is useless to talk about choosing the right words when the

subject is too deep for oral expression.

This phenomenon is a little less mysterious when it is contemplated in the light of what happens to us when we become Christians. In his revelation of the new birth, Jesus said, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." This means that in the new creation we receive a spirit, the spiritual counterpart to the body we received when we were born the first time. This spirit not only originates from the Holy Spirit, but its presence within us depends on the simultaneous presence of the Holy Spirit. Although the two are not identical, there is such affinity between them that one does not have one without the other.

I have heard many hours of debate on the precise meaning of the word "spirit" in certain passages in Romans 8. The question is, does the Spirit (or spirit) in such texts refer to the Holy Spirit, God's spirit, Christ's spirit, or to man's spirit? That is one question I no longer worry about, because there is no practical difference, since you can't have one without the other. That there is a distinction between our spirit and the Holy Spirit is made clear by Romans 8:15-16: "When we cry, 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God." Yet the cry which is here attributed to us is elsewhere attributed to the Spirit: "And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba! Father!'" (Gal. 4:6). So, although there is a distinction, it is not a great one. For this reason there is only a slight difference between our wordless sighs and those of the Spirit within us. Nevertheless, Paul attributes the unutterable sighs to the Spirit, not to us.

Paul says further that "he who searches the hearts of men knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because [the RSV margin is

**If we pray according to the will of God,
it is of little moment what we say, or whether we speak at all.**

better: *that*] the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God." The word "heart" is here used in the all-inclusive sense and denotes the center and source of the whole inner life. The one who searches is, of course, God. And what does God find when he searches our hearts? He finds the Spirit there, sighing with sighs too deep for words. But what does this mean to God? Very much, for he knows what is the mind of the Spirit; that is, he knows the mind-set of the Spirit, what he is striving for, what his intentions are, namely, that his intercession for the saints is "according to the will of God." The will of God is the norm which governs the intercession.

Adherence to this norm is the one thing that really matters when we try to pray. If we pray according to the will of God, it is of little moment what we say, or whether we speak at all. Our communion with him is so close that we need no spoken word. And if we speak amiss, no real harm is done, for the Spirit's accord with the will of God is so far beyond question that his intercession for us never fails. With his help, the greatest bungler among us will never be able to mess it up.

Given the perspective which Romans 8:26-27 provides, we must say that the friend whom I mentioned earlier, who could never say a prayer out loud but was always thinking one, had a great deal going for him. If his intentions were good, if the will of God was the norm of his life, we had no reason to lose sleep over the manner of his communion. The same may be said for the other brother who made his every public prayer an ostentatious oration. Whatever deficiencies it may have had in meeting the needs of the rest of the congregation, it was not rejected in heaven merely because of the ignorance of the speaker. None of us knows how to pray as he ought.

I heard one Christian say of another a few years ago that his prayer in the assembly was so awful it was really good. He meant that the stammering of the one who prayed had emerged from an honest heart which was too conscious of God to be unduly concerned with the congregation's opinion about his eloquence. I have had many such impressions, and I say this to encourage those who think they cannot pray in a public gathering.

I realize, of course, that the Bible provides us with several examples of public prayer, and I do not discount the value—even the necessity—of clearly stated petitions in the assembly. Paul criticized the ecstasies at Corinth by asking, "How can any one . . . say the 'Amen' to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying? For you may give thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified." The edification of the other person must always be considered in the assembly. If the uncomprehending congregation is deprived of its "Amen" (unfortunately this would not be considered a great loss in many places today) because the line of communication has been almost entirely vertical, the objectives of public worship have not been met. But the same will be true if the stammerers and stutterers are discouraged from participating in the prayers.

When Jesus warned his disciples not to be like the Gentiles, who think they will be heard for their many words, he gave this reason: "for your Father knows what you need before you ask him." If that is true, then why should we bother to pray? If prayer is "the divine in us appealing to the God above us," then why not remain totally passive and quit worrying about how to pray?

Apart from the fact that the man who adores God will have as much trouble keeping quiet about it as the man who

adores his wife, there is tremendous value in the act of praying. While I would not want to reduce prayer to a purely psychological phenomenon, I do note in reading the Psalms a progression from depression to elation, a movement from "my soul is cast down within me" to "why are you cast down, O my soul?" For a good example read Psalm 6, in which the speaker within ten verses rises from the verge of emotional collapse to a cry of victory!

Surely God wants us to pray for the good we get from praying. We do not

need to coax him into hearing our pleas, for his grace is always ahead of our desire for it. We do not need to spell out for him what we need, because we are too ignorant for that, and he already knows anyway. We do not need to be eloquent, for at times unspeakable groans are all the most articulate can manage. But we do need to stay as close to him as possible, and therefore we need to pray with whatever strength our weak nature can muster, for this fundamental act of communion will have a marvelous effect *on us*. □

THE DEVIL'S ADVOCATE

How can anyone living in the 20th century believe some of that stuff in the gospels? Take, for instance, the parable of the weeds in the field, where the servants were not allowed to pull the weeds out of the wheat. Now that may work all right with wheat, but in the church it just doesn't wash. How can the church survive if it doesn't dispose of the heretics? Do you think for one minute the truth can survive alongside their lies? No, they have to be gotten rid of, one way or another. And surely those churches which have divorced members cannot be expected to leave them alone. If they do, it is bound to kill the church.

Or take the parable of the seed growing by itself. If that means that you can just tell people the truth and then let them respond in their own good time, I don't buy it. As any good salesman knows, when you've made your presentation you have to get the name on the dotted line. If you let them take their time, they will never buy. Why, that parable could ruin our gospel meetings and do away with our personal work programs—and even the invitation song!

Or how about the parable of the sower? Do you mean to tell me that a good farmer will waste his seed on the rocks and thorns, not to mention the road? No, we have to be careful what we do with our seed if we don't want to wind up on welfare. The church needs to be discriminating. Unless we are careful whom we try to teach, we will just be wasting our resources. There are some people who will never

make good Christians, and we need to learn to recognize them in advance.

One of the most incredible things is that story about the master who comes and girds himself and has his servants sit at the table while *he serves them!* Anybody who tries that is asking for a lot of trouble. You give some people an inch, and they'll take a mile. The next thing you know, *they'll* be the masters, and you'll be waiting on them. If we start catering to the lower levels of society, there's going to be one big explosion!

And what about that fellow who left his ninety-nine sheep on the hillside and went off to look for the one that was lost? A wolf could come in and make havoc, or someone could steal the whole flock. I say we had better guard what we have. We had better just take care of those in the fold, rather than wandering around after the ones that are lost. Anyway, it is their own fault they are lost.

Now the really smart man in the gospels is the one criticized for laying up for his old days. You have to admire a man who plans his retirement so that he will not be beholden to anyone. It's just too risky anyway, depending on your relatives or even the government to take care of you. Of course, some people will criticize you for laying up much goods for many days, but the really prudent man will be too independent to be bothered about other people's opinions. He will never let anybody interfere with his security.

Much of what we are as individuals is read into us during those first crucial years of life.

TRUST AND THE STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN COMMUNITY

STEVEN SPIDELL

Houston, Texas

That we live in a world which knows more about despair and meaningless and broken hearts than about hope and meaningful and healthful relationships is news to no one. A number of recent articles and magazines have helped to highlight some present issues.

For example, in the August, 1975, issue of *Harper's* there is an article entitled "The Revolt Against Love." Written by Dr. Herbert Hendin, it is the result, in part, of a six-year study of college students. Two paragraphs will serve to illustrate our point.

On the surface, there is an openness, a casual camaraderie in the way young middle-class men and women regard each other that has led many people to believe that we are entering an age of unprecedented sexual harmony. In my experience, however, this much-celebrated openness of each sex to the other has meant, as well, a greater openness to fear and anger, and a general cynicism, disillusionment, and bitterness that one rarely found among the young twenty years ago.

If our physical environment is worth saving, our emotional environment is even more deserving of protection, since the one provides us with means to sustain life while the other is our humanity; the one offers the necessities of survival, the other a life worth living. There is no governmental agency to protect our emotional environment and speak for its primacy in our lives.

Yet the equivalent of air and water is the source of the ability to love, to feel, to endure. The most endangered of our vital resources is people.

Just a few months ago Jules Pfeiffer drew a cartoon containing a series of drawings of a woman who says:

I was fat. Men weren't attracted to me.
I went on a diet. Men came around.
The men hurt me. I went off my diet.
The men went away.
I went on a diet. The men came back.
The men hurt me. I went off my diet.
Now I've got it down to a system.
Six months of men.
Six months of fat.
The secret of survival.

And finally, Alan Dahm writes in the preface to his book *Emotional Intimacy*:

The thesis of this book is that an enlightened commitment to constructive human relationships at all levels of the social system is not a sentimental preoccupation. It is an overlooked requirement for individual and collective survival which is as essential to life as food, water, and sleep. Without some degree of emotional intimacy, we will kill each other. Tragically, we seem to need a "reason" to reach out to each other. Survival is a good reason.

Such issues cannot be allowed to escape the serious attention and reflection of those of us who are concerned with the character and content of the religious education program of the church. The following remarks are an attempt to ad-

dress, at one level, the development of the human personality, as well as the church's stake in that process.

One way to approach the problem of intimacy is to consider the human will. Silvano Arieti, in his book *The Will to Be Human*, has provided some interesting material concerning how we are to deal with other people.

Needless to say, to simply raise the question of the will and its connection with human development is no easy matter. Unfortunately, it is anything but clear that individuals have at their command the power of optional discriminations. In an age which judges life by the inner workings of the machine (best epitomized by the computer), notions such as will and freedom remain, for not a few, only notions; that is, they are incapable of verification. If freedom is an attribute of man and if people do possess wills, it is still to be shown how they work themselves out in human life, as, for example, in the question of intimacy.

The complexity of the problem of understanding the birth and development of the will and its potential for free choice is demonstrated by the early life of people, from birth through early childhood. Psychoanalysis has shown to what a phenomenal extent we are informed by and shaped by our relations to our parents, to society, and to the instinctual powers of life and death. It is not stretching the point to assert that much of what we are as individuals is read into us during those first crucial years of life when the child is totally vulnerable to every sense and perception which bombards him.

But it is important to note in this connection that the concept which first begins to order the child's experiences relates to his need to survive. The child, then, acts in response to his needs to be fed, loved, and approved. Early behavior

is directed by those needs. Thus the will is born, directed totally at assuring the meeting of basic physical and emotional needs, including the need for intimacy.

The child "understands" early in life that if his needs are to be met, then he must obey the commands of his parents. To disobey and risk their disapproval and the withdrawal of love and intimacy is tantamount to suicide. Thus the child achieves satisfaction by satisfying the demands of his parents, being directed by their wills and his own will to survive. As the infant develops in interaction with his parents, the external commands and expectations of the parents will become increasingly internalized, so that the behavior necessary to assure the maintenance of a harmonious relationship will result automatically, as it were.

This same process is repeated at a phylogenetic level. That is to say, culture itself exerts its incredibly powerful influence on the development of the person's will. Society demands, and rightly so, certain basic types of behavior, lest society itself cease to function. The individual must conform to society's demands, as the child does to his parents', if he is to survive.

The will, then, is bound in on all sides by far greater powers, which not only stand outside but also speak from within the individual himself.

Now in this struggle of the will with itself, with parents, society, and instincts, three basic things may happen. The first possibility is a radically negative event. The whole process of the growth and development of the will breaks down from pressure (originating either interpersonally or socially or both), resulting in schizophrenia, obsessive-compulsive neuroses, or catatonia. The mind of the individual refuses to bear the burden of growth and frustration and pressure, and

How can we learn to trust again, suffering as we do the shocks of indifference, disloyalty, and self-centeredness?

he withdraws from a "normal" view of reality.

The second possibility, while perhaps not as dramatic, is much more common and is equally insidious. In this case the individual is so locked in to the customs, standards, patterns, and mores of society that he is induced by the internalization of societal norms and their awesome power to will only the will of society. The tragedy of this state is that the individual may truly feel that he is willing and choosing on his own, and may never come to grips with his very real personal slavery. The development of this second situation provides the fertile soil in which men of the caliber of Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin can take root and infest the world.

The third alternative, which is by far the most difficult path, is that the individual will so grow and develop that his will can transcend parental, instinctual and societal programming and actualize itself as human with a "free" capacity for personal decisions. From within the context of the internalized power of parents and society, the individual chooses to will to be what he is and can be, to actually make decisions for his own good as well as for the greater good of society. While freedom remains "merely" relative, he grasps the alternatives and makes his decisions. He takes seriously his own private world — rational and irrational, good and bad — and strives to be and do good. He also takes seriously the norms of society, but not as ends in themselves to be followed blindly. This third alternative alone provides the occasion for the redevelopment of intimacy, which has been lost since childhood.

The living of a full human life involves two requirements. The first is the mature will of the individual as it has come to development in his ego. The mature will

(that is, one which directs its energy toward true humanness) has come to an understanding of the power of the external and internal forces and by that understanding maintains itself against the evil and suffering of others, transcending the destructive elements in the personality itself and in parental and societal manipulations.

But also, the strength and purposive nature of the will must be grounded in the rediscovery of trust. Only by a trust in an overarching structure to existence will one ultimately have the vision, the confidence, and the energy to rise above the forces which threaten to destroy not only the ego but civilization itself. Until such an openness, lost since childhood, has been renewed, a broader perspective of analysis and action for the common good is not a realistic possibility. Without such a trust, the powerful forces of evil will regain control and pervert any mode of living into just another justification for the robbery of human life of its true purpose and goal.

The need for intimacy, based on a recovery of trust, is a real one in the world today, and what is at stake in all of this is our personal well-being. But how can we learn to trust again, suffering as we do the shocks of indifference, disloyalty, and self-centeredness? Do we release our all too tentative grasps on our egos and yield to everything our culture seeks to implant in us? Or do we tighten up on that grip and launch out on our own, forsaking all relationships with others? Can we learn to trust again?

A word comes to us from that most culturally conditioned of institutions, the church. From beyond the councils, the wars, and the dogmas comes a word which quietly speaks to us, at the level of our deepest need, once again of trust. A word meant for those of us who have all but

given up on ourselves and society. Down through the corridors of time, in the eternal present, we hear that message which is beyond ourselves and our culture: there is One who is trustworthy. This One comes to us as a child who trusts, as a God who is faithful.

Perhaps here is a beginning point for knowledge about what we are to do with our lives. There He stands when we fail ourselves or others. And when others let us down, there He stands, calling us to faithfulness, to trust, to intimacy.

If we learn to trust again, in honesty and openness, at last unfettered by immature egos and strangling norms, it will surely be because we have been able to trust the One who is the source of life and community and intimacy.

Is it too much to ask that the church

address itself, through the various aspects of its life, to the issue of personal development and relationships within the human community? For the church alone brings no agenda to dealing with people and the world other than the wholeness of life witnessed to in Jesus Christ. The church must take seriously the development of persons, the challenges and risks of society, and the difficulties in establishing intimate personal relations today. Surely the task of the education office of the church must be to address itself to such concerns. To be sure, some will argue that such is not the task of "religious" education. But if it is the case that such concerns are not "religious" in the deepest sense, then I can only fear who will set the stakes if the church keeps its hands off. □

SOME ANNOUNCEMENTS

Campus Minister Wanted: Craig Watts will leave the Reference Point project in Flint in September in order to pursue graduate studies at Vanderbilt, and a replacement for him will be needed at that time. If you are interested, or know of someone who is, contact me, and I will pass your name on to the committee. You may call me at 313/694-3582.

National Bicentennial Conference: A national bicentennial conference, entitled "Alexander Campbell and the Spirit of the American Revolution," will be held July 7-10 at Bethany College. It is jointly sponsored by Bethany and Pepperdine University and will examine ways in which the spirit of the American Revolution affected Campbell and, through him, millions of Americans to the present day. From among the 18 speakers we may mention the following: Robert O. Fife ("Alexander Campbell's Role in the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829-1830"), Bill Humble ("The Seeds of Division in the Restoration Movement: Alexander Campbell and the Republic"), Earl West ("The Churches of Christ and Civil Government from 1900 to 1918: Some Tentative Observations"), David Edwin Harrell, Jr. ("The Churches of Christ and American Civil Religion Since 1945"), and Franklin H. Littell ("Religious Restoration and American Politics"). There will also be a dis-

cussion of Richard Hughes' AAR paper, "From Primitive Church to Civil Religion: The Millennial Odyssey of Alexander Campbell." William Banowsky and Perry E. Gresham will conclude with "The Restoration Movement and the Contemporary Political Order." For more information write Public Information Office, Bethany College, Bethany, WV 26032, or call 304/829-7221.

Exposition Available: If you are interested in reading a documented, in-depth study of the head covering, you should write to Bruce Terry, Box 54, Goldsmith, TX 79741, for a mimeographed copy of his "An Exposition of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16." There is no charge.

Wanted for Binding: If you have copies of *Integrity* (June, 1969; November and December, 1970; March, 1971; October, 1974) and *Sentinel of Truth* (July, 1968; December, 1969; January, 1970; February, 1970) which you are willing to part with, contact Norman L. Parks, 404 Minerva Drive, Murfreesboro, TN 37130. He would like to have them for binding.

If you will send \$1 to Amos Ponder, 1269 Pickwick Place, Flint, Michigan 48507, he will send you a copy of Norman Parks' *Woman's Place in Church Activity*. —HL

A CHILD'S FIRST STEPS

SHEILA DALTON

Beltsville, Maryland

Children in the *same* family are different *ages*; therefore, they are at different levels of growth, ability, and understanding. Does the eight year old yell at the eight month old and say, "You don't belong to this family because you can't talk or walk or do things I can do—or understand things as I do!"? How absurd! we think. Certainly, all of the children belong to the family in spite of differences in personality, talents, maturity, understandings, and experiences.

Even as adults we have grown somewhat to expect and accept—even if we disagree with—the differences in looks, personality, and physical and emotional health that people exhibit. Why can we not reflect this same attitude in our spiritual growth and differences? They are there just as definitely as anything else.

We can be so well informed and tolerant of people who are slow learners academically, or of first graders just beginning to read, and of recognizing other differences in people. We pat ourselves on our shoulders and say, "See how loving and kindhearted I am because I allow for these differences as being natural facts of life."

But on the other hand, when it comes to living within God's spiritual family, we are so ignorant and intolerant of one another's spiritual differences and maturity. Can we not rest peacefully with the assurance that as the baby is nurtured, loved, encouraged, and disciplined by his parents, the life in him will respond joyfully to each phase of his growth?

The other children in the family can

recognize that the baby can not do things that they can—they also recognize that at one time they were in the same place. They can enter into the adventure of watching baby grow; they can help teach him; they can even laugh at some of his silly mistakes—realizing this is a necessary part of learning; they can kiss his hurt fingers or bumped head. All of these things done together build relationships of love and trust between the children. When they find a problem too big to handle they know they can turn to their parents for guidance and help.

As long as we avail ourselves of the nurture, love, and discipline of our Heavenly Father, the life within us (Jesus is our life) *will* grow by the power of His Spirit working in us both to will and to do.

As children of God, can we not lead our younger brothers and sisters to our Father for help and guidance, instead of yelling at them and calling them degrading names?

We have such a faithful Father who always wants to help us grow into a more abundant, joyful life. And that *abundant* life depends so much on what we give and receive from each other. Let us spend more time together, talking with our Father, reading His Word, and sharing our lives together in an attitude of love, humility, and submission—one to another. Let us grow up spiritually as well as we have physically and mentally—and let us all remember that it takes time.

"Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these." □

LETTERS

Too Much Suspense

Please! Send me the May issue of *Integrity* as soon as it is available. As a Freed-Hardeman graduate and a battle-scarred veteran of the Open Forum Wars I am in nail-biting suspense until I read the conclusion of Don Haymes' article on "The Lectureship" and find out what that "something" is that was about to happen.

I mean, really, this is worse than watching "As the World Turns" on a Friday afternoon! What's going to happen?

... Will someone make a crack about bald preachers and set Woods up for one of his famous no hair jokes?

... Will someone dare contradict the Great One by pointing out that local preachers as we have them today are unknown in the New Testament?

... Will Ira Rice speak in tongues?

... Will some fool expose himself to Woods' rapier-like tongue by wondering out loud if the eldership is an office anyway?

... Will lightning strike and thunder roll as if in divine endorsement of the official position?

I tell you, the suspense is almost unbearable. For my sake and for all those who remember the Open Farce (oops, I mean, Forum) you've got to get that May issue out early!

Chattanooga, Tennessee STEVE PARSONS

From the Counter

Well, I've done it! Done what I've thought about for a long time. I have noticed an increasing tendency to refer to men's ideas rather than God's in the writings of your contributors, so today I decided to make a count. And the Grand Total is . . . 21 to 5. Twenty-one references to theologians and others all the way from Martin Luther to Alexander Campbell to Hans Kung, and only 5 references to the Bible—in

any form. That's all in the January-February 1976 issue of *Integrity*.

I'm not sure at all what that means exactly, but I sure have a sneaking suspicion. And as far as I'm concerned, it's about time for all of us who say we are seeking so desperately and earnestly for the will of God to put our pens where our mouths are.

Warrenton, Oregon

JACK OSBORN

Reactions to April Editorial

The excellent editorial in the April issue prompted me to write. I was practically born in a Church of Christ pew, but when I finally "grew up," it was not completely by choice. I was dumped into the real world by the death of my husband, with three teenagers, a full-time, low-paying job, and absolutely no training (after all, I had known my place "in the home").

As I became aware of the real world, the absolute naivete of women in the church, the absurd attitude of men, and the realities of the women's movement, then when I attended worship there was no joy, only guilt, frustration and anger—a definite split in my feelings. I'd sit in church seething over stupid remarks ("those women libbers"), the fear tactics concerning the E.R.A., and the ridiculous "gospels according to the bulletin." How I longed for a positive sermon—hope!

Then came *Integrity*. At last there were people who supported what I had secretly believed for a long time. And now the Lord has led us to a supportive congregation. I can't tell you how thankful I am, because I had reached the point where I had decided that "church" and "religion" were no longer believable. Now there is hope!

NAME WITHHELD

Your editorial "In the Garden" was excellent. I particularly agreed with your comments about the "total woman" formula.

Ardmore, Oklahoma KATHLEEN M. DUNCAN

I just can't resist the impulse to yell *Eureka!* You've found it, the word for Marabel Morgan: "mother of manipulators." Mmmm—good. I am not a Total Woman nor would my husband want one. I will not degrade myself nor insult him with such a philosophy.

NAME WITHHELD