

Integrity

Volume 6 FEBRUARY 1975 Number 9

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hoy Ledbetter, Editor-in-Chief David F. Graf
Joseph F. Jones Frank Rester Dean A. Thoroman

INTEGRITY 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.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Names may be added to the 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.

MANUSCRIPTS

Articles written exclusively for *Integrity* are welcomed.

WARNING

Readers who fail to notify us of address changes (even slight ones) will be dropped.

February 1975

Integrity

Integrity

8494 Bush Hill Court
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

Nonprofit Organization

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID

Flint, Michigan 48501
Permit No. 239

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Board of Directors

THE PASTORAL PATTERN

Hoy Ledbetter

THE FAMILY OF GOD

Allen Holden, Jr.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

Don Reece

REFLECTIONS ON THE VICTIMS

Terry Osmon

COMMENT

The Editors

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

From the Board of Directors

In order that our readers and writers may have a clear understanding of our objectives, and that we ourselves may maintain a clear perspective and a balanced journal which both reflects and inspires integrity, we issue the following statement.

We intend to provide a refined and respected literary medium for sharing the Good News of God in Christ to people of varying needs: to all who are searching for the abundant life; to believers who require reaffirmation of their faith and the reassurance of the Christian message; and to the corporate body of Christ whose mission is to witness his message to the world.

Since the Word of God is the ultimate criterion for determining the authenticity of everything the church is and does, our aim is to publish articles that are the result of keen exegetical study of the Scriptures and are at the same time interesting and understandable to our readers and related to their moral and spiritual needs.

In order that our efforts may be directed toward the mission of Christ, and not our own, we will encourage intensive inquiry into the origins of the Christian community and our religious heritage. This goal implies a recognition that dogma is often formulated as a defense against what is considered heresy, that the interpretation of Scripture is conditioned both historically and ideologically by the context in which it is articulated, and that multiple pressures are exerted on the conscience to remain loyal to the particular religious tradition one has embraced.

Since the Christian life essentially involves right relationships, we will make a concerted effort toward providing Biblical answers to questions of fellowship and unity.

We believe that all Christians must share the responsibility of determining the meaning of Jesus Christ in our lives and that the Spirit of Truth is not confined to any enclave of believers. Accordingly, we encourage response from all who recog-

nize Jesus as Lord, irrespective of their convictions or affiliation.

We will continue to provide a forum in which sincere yet different points of view may be stated with Christian candor and competence. This policy necessarily entails publishing some conclusions at variance with our own, which will ordinarily be done without editorial judgment under the assumption that our readers are capable of evaluating diverse viewpoints for themselves.

We will provide an opportunity for the publication of at least limited amounts of reader response, negative as well as positive. This freedom of expression will be restricted only in terms of irrelevance, undue repetition, blatant crudeness, personal attack, and shallow treatment of subject matter.

Our writers will speak with dignity, sincerity, and seriousness, honestly expressing the truth they have received from God, in words that are rational because they reflect His perspective and bear conviction to reasonable minds. Since a valid teaching ministry requires continual awareness of and adaptation to the needs of a changing world, we expect to constantly adjust our emphasis so as to remain pertinent to the serious issues our readers face.

Finally, it is our unwavering aim to remain totally under God's guidance and dependent upon his grace.

DAVID F. GRAF
GENE HATCHER
RICHARD HODSON
JOSEPH F. JONES, *Vice-Chairman*
HOY LEDBETTER
AMOS PONDER, *Secretary*
FRANK RESTER
JIM ROGERS
HOWARD STARK
DARRELL A. THOROMAN, *Treasurer*
DEAN A. THOROMAN, *Chairman*
MICHAEL TUCKER
JAMES WELKER

FROM THE EDITOR

THE PASTORAL PATTERN

My purpose in this article is to provide a Scriptural basis for the manner in which we—in the statement on the preceding page—pledge ourselves to speak. The early church, of course, did not engage in journalistic endeavors, but, although technology has given us more versatility, the principles of Christian teaching remain the same. For this reason, what follows will be of concern to all our readers, for all, we may assume, have an interest in effective communication of the Good News.

No text seems better suited to my purpose than the one which includes the word *integrity*, which is Titus 2:7-8: “**Show yourself in all respects a model of good deeds, and in your teaching show integrity, gravity, and sound speech that cannot be censured, so that an opponent may be put to shame, having nothing evil to say of us.**”

In this passage Paul tells Titus what kind of man he should be as a preacher. The emphasis is on personal qualities rather than the content of his teaching. It was necessary for him, as it is for any minister, to manifest

a happy combination of correct living and correct teaching. We frequently need this reminder that a successful teaching ministry requires a flesh-and-blood illustration of the power of religion. And, although “praiseworthy deeds” which show a consistent moral character may not be as obvious in written as in oral communication, this need applies to publishing ministries such as *Integrity*. The burden of our writing must never be merely a matter of academic interest, but should project the conviction that our lives have been radically affected by what we say.

In All Respects: Pattern . . .

With this intent Paul calls upon Titus to show himself in all respects a model of good deeds. *Model* is an interesting word, especially in Greek, where it refers to *the effect of a blow or pressure*. It can denote either a mold from which something is formed, or the thing formed itself. From these basic meanings various others are derived, but the fundamental idea of an impression will help us to understand New Testament usage.

But we must not make too much of this pressure, as if to say that the model of good deeds is to force others to conform to his image. The one who molds others may do so because he himself has been molded by God. He bears the molding power of the word because he has been molded by the word. Since his life has been transformed by the gospel, it has a transforming effect on others and attests to the truth of what he preaches. When Peter told the elders to be “examples to the flock” (1 Pet. 5:3), and when Paul urged Timothy to “set the believers an example” (1 Tim. 4:12), they were asking those men to be living representatives of the word, to which others could respond in faith and the freedom of the Spirit. In

the absence of such attestation, unbelievers—and perhaps believers also—will at best ignore the message and at worst censure it.

Inner Attitude: Integrity . . .

Next, Titus is to show *integrity*. Paul could say this with a straight face because of the character of his own ministry, of which he speaks in 2 Cor. 4:2: “We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways; we refuse to practice cunning or to tamper with God’s word, but by the open statement of the truth we would commend ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

When we hear this sort of preacher we can be sure that what we hear exactly represents his belief. He has nothing to hide. He never waits until “the brethren are ready for it” to declare his convictions, but is always open and above-board. There is no trickery, no taking of passages out of context and misapplying them, no ingratiating back-slapping, no self-interest. On the contrary, there is “open statement of the truth” made “in the sight of God” (and this last phrase is not insignificant).

Returning to Titus, we read in 1:11 of some who were “teaching for base gain what they have no right to teach.” Surely few of us would deliberately lie about such grave matters for the sake of money, but we may have come dangerously close. Even those who tell the truth are in trouble when they begin to tell it for money. I am told that some of our preachers are now making over \$30,000 a year. All who receive such salaries may be men of unquestioned integrity, but “the shameful purpose of making money” (TEV) will flourish under such opportunities for a lucrative career.

However, less mercenary people will show a lack of integrity in other ways. Some suc-

cumb to the widespread temptation to exercise power over others, or to use the pulpit as a means of getting attention or of showing how smart they are. I recall with some grief how a young friend urged me several years ago to go to the mission field, because, he assured me, after a couple of years in mission work I could return with a reputation and would have more calls for meetings than I could fill. It is fortunate that he never went, for our usually reliable missionaries do not need to be hampered by insincere coworkers who are merely promoting their careers.

Outward Deportment: Gravity . . .

The Greek word for “gravity” may also be translated “dignity,” and the versions alternate between these two words. We must keep in mind that here, too, Paul is not emphasizing what Titus is to teach but the quality of his life as a teacher. The reference is to dignity of manner and therefore implies “the presence of poise and self-respect in one’s deportment to a degree that inspires respect.” (We may add as a footnote that Aristotle defines the original word as the mean between stubborn arrogance and excessive compliance.) Titus must speak and act in earnest and be concerned with what is really important instead of trivia.

The word *gravity* reminds me of an evening I spent with a veteran preacher whose conversation consisted almost entirely of frivolous jokes. One could have, with a degree of seriousness, applied to him the well-known remark of John Dennis: “A man who could make so vile a pun would not scruple to pick a pocket.” Although my companion did not fall quite as low in my estimation as a thief, I did find myself—very much against my will—losing confidence in him as a counselor in the weightier matters of life.

This apparent lack of seriousness is not an uncommon criticism of Christian leaders. While there is much to be said for using the God-given ability to laugh, gravity, by definition, involves dignity and a certain somberness which are lacking in life-of-the-party types. People have a right to expect a degree of high-mindedness in their spiritual leaders.

A few months ago, while I was discarding several books for which I no longer had shelf space, I began thumbing through a debate that had escaped previous purges. I had very strong feelings about the point at issue back in the fifties, and I learned at this late hour that my loyalty to “our side” had blinded me to the fact that “the enemy” had won. The whole affair resembled a circus more than a theological forum, but the disputant whose views I then opposed (and still do) showed much more dignity than his opponent and should have won my heart. It is no wonder that serious students today are wary of such exchanges. What a pity that mudslingers and smart alecks have ruined what might have been profitable opportunities for discussion of differences.

The high moral tone which Paul urges upon Titus will lift us above pettiness and touchiness. It will enable us to respect each other and reason with each other rather than shouting each other down. It will deliver us from ambition to have the last word at all costs, and will keep us from turning every controversy into a personal attack. It is no denial of humility (dignity is not arrogance or aloofness) to say that one measure of an evangelist is how much he is above.

Message: Sound Speech . . .

Those of us who read a variety of journals are accustomed to hearing, from incompat-

ible sources, *sound speech* defined as orthodox doctrine, but that definition grows out of contemporary controversy rather than solid Biblical exegesis. It is true that in the Pastoral Epistles, where the term is used, it stands in opposition to false teaching, but the teaching under consideration consists of “myths and endless genealogies which promote speculations” (1 Tim. 1:4). As opposed to such a “speculative soteriology slanted away from the world,” sound speech in this context, Ulrich Luck argues, is concerned “with true, rational and proper life in the world, which as creation is characterized by order and reason” (*TDNT*, VIII, 312).

Luck also contends that this term can be understood only against the Greek-Hellenistic background in which the original word (*hugiēs*) has the general sense of “rational,” “intelligent,” “pertinent.” This view is confirmed by Arndt-Gingrich: “Thus, in accord w. prevailing usage, Christian teaching is designated as the *correct* [or *sound*] doctrine, since it is reasonable and appeals to sound intelligence.”

But one may ask, “If the original means ‘rational,’ ‘intelligent,’ and ‘pertinent,’ why does my translation use ‘sound?’” One reason is that “sound” is a perfectly good word to represent them, as the following definitions in *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* indicate:

5. Founded on valid reasoning; free from misapprehension; sensible and correct: *a sound observation*.
6. Thorough; complete: *a sound flogging*.
7. . . .
8. Free from moral defect; upright; honorable . . .
9. Worthy of confidence; trustworthy.
10. Marked by or showing common sense and good judgment; level-headed.

Of course, sound speech comes from God and will be—or at least at one time will have been—considered orthodox, but this term

implies a great deal more than that. It calls upon the minister of the word to deliver his message in reasonable terms, to appeal to the intelligence of his listeners, and to speak to them of matters of ultimate concern. It is a corrective to the ranting and raving that often masquerade as preaching, to poorly prepared presentations, and to canned sermons that neither make sense nor matter to those who receive them.

I think this understanding of Paul is especially important in view of the wave of anti-intellectualism that has swept over our religious culture. I doubt that Paul would have much sympathy with our suspicion of liberal arts colleges, or that John would be happy with our corruption of his assurance to those who were being seduced by Gnosticism: "the anointing which you received from him abides in you, and you have no need that any one should teach you; as his anointing teaches you about everything" (1 Jn. 2:27).

The Negative Illustrated . . .

No accusation can be sustained against the sort of saint Paul urged Titus to be. But it is interesting that in this same epistle there is a reference to the "man who is factious," of whom Paul says "he is self-condemned." This cannot mean that he passes adverse judgment upon himself because he knows he is wrong, but rather that those who are his opponents can rest their case on his own behavior. We would do well to remind ourselves frequently that those who possess the party spirit always suffer from a credibility gap. To reasonable people they appear to be exactly what they are: factious, *not* faithful.

But there is another illustration that may more closely relate to our own situation.

Paul says in Galatians 2:11: "But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned" (a form of the same word used in Tit. 2:8, without the negative prefix). So Peter exemplifies in this instance the sort of person who may be justly censured. Why? "For before certain men came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party. And with him the rest of the Jews acted insincerely, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their insincerity."

This wholesale abandonment of integrity under fear of what conservative brethren might do undoubtedly resulted in some very anxious moments at Antioch, but there is reason to believe that Paul, the champion of "open statement of the truth," won the day, and that Peter, Barnabas, and the others saw and abandoned their hypocrisy. Perhaps with more ministers like Paul we can overcome such tendencies in our own time.

It is unfortunately the case that ministers who fail for lack of integrity bring others down with them. As Paul saw it, the adverse party would speak evil "of us," not of Titus alone. This fact should intensify the concern of the whole church that its reputation be protected against the harm which unreliable ministers may cause.

We require today, no less than in the first century, messages in our pulpits and papers which come from spokesmen who bear the impress of God and therefore by noble lives attest to the power and beauty of the gospel; who honestly speak from innocent motives; who teach with dignity and seriousness; and whose message is sound because it is intelligently prepared, reasonably presented, and applied to the particular needs of those who hear it. Nothing less will do. □

THE FAMILY OF GOD

ALLEN HOLDEN, Jr.

Fort Worth, Texas

One of the things that makes reading the Bible so exciting is the myriad of literature and figures of speech that are used by the writers. I find apocalypse, letters, historical narrative, poetry, prophecy, songs and tracts. I also notice allegories, parables, metaphors, proverbs and hyperbole. I have already looked at one of my favorite metaphors in my last article, "The Body of Christ" (*Integrity*, December 1974). In this piece, we will look at another metaphor, that of God's people being the family of God.

Marriage . . .

One theme running throughout history is that the relationship of God to his people can be compared to a marriage relationship. Though this is a complete subject in itself, it is advantageous to look at it briefly here. This idea says to me that God expects a one-to-one relationship with his people, characterized by intimacy, sharing, communion, devotion and caring. There is a sense in which this relationship is exclusive: God expects our complete surrender to only him, and not to any other person. To have a relationship with the Lord is often termed "to know the Lord," the same terminology used to describe the sexual relationship between a man and a woman. The prophets also utilize this symbolism, with Hosea being probably the best known example. The text runs thus:

When the Lord first spoke through Hosea, the Lord said to Hosea, "Go, take to yourself a wife of harlotry and have children of harlotry,

for the land commits great harlotry by forsaking the Lord" (Hosea 1:2).

In other words, the Lord says, "The way you are treating me reminds me of a wife who hurts her husband by running out and becoming a prostitute." That is pretty descriptive. It communicates the magnitude of the sin that God's people commit when they turn their backs on him, and it speaks of the pain that our God feels when we ignore him and proceed to do our own thing. Furthermore, the immensity of God's love and grace is all the more apparent, in that he takes us back in spite of the pain that we have caused him, and the grossness of our actions.

In the new agreement between heaven and earth, the people of God are called the bride of Christ. In addition to the previously mentioned ideas, this one also tells us that there is both a present and a future dimension to our relationship. There is a sense in which the marriage has not yet taken place. We are preparing for the biggest wedding of all times, when the bride and groom finally get together, after all the anticipation, excitement and separation of courtship (Rev. 21-22). But there is also a present dimension, a sense in which we are already married, for we have bared our souls before him, have given ourselves to him without reservation, and have pledged our love to the Lord.

Mother and Child . . .

A seldom noticed use of the imagery of the family is the way in which the mother-

child relationship is used. The most famous quote is in Matthew's work, where Jesus says:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! (Matthew 23:37).

The depth of love and the sacrificial care of a mother speaks well to us of the kind of concern that Jesus here feels. Since all of us have mothers, we can appreciate the metaphorical usage of maternal love to explain the love of Jesus.

This maternal love is a theme also employed by Paul. Writing to the church at Thessalonica, he said,

But we were gentle among you, like a nurse taking care of her children. So, being affectionately desirous of you, we were ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you had become very dear to us (1 Thessalonians 2:7-8).

Not only does maternal love serve as an example of Jesus' concern for Israel (and us), but it can also explain the empathy and concern of one Christian for another.

The New Birth . . .

There are at least two senses in which we read of the people of God being the family of God. In the first, we read of a new birth, a birth that is both a second birth and a birth from above (John 3:3-5). We are born of water and the Spirit, and thus enter God's new family, a part of the new creation. We have a new spirit inside us, and we are new people (Ezekiel 36:26).

In this sense, the family is made up of the Father, the Son, and all who have been born into the family. As the song says,

God is my father
And Jesus is my brother
And the blessed Holy Spirit is my guide

We won't get bogged down in the details of

the birth process, except to point out that it is a supernatural birth that we have experienced, a birth that somehow involves our faith, the word, and the direct intervention of the Spirit of God.

Adoption . . .

We also read that we have entered the family by being adopted into it. In this sense, Jesus is the natural son, and we are adopted sons and daughters, chosen by the Father and made a part of the family. This concept can tell us a lot about our place in God's scheme of things. All of us are acquainted, to varying degrees, with the adoption process in this country. Some of us have adopted children, and some were themselves adopted. What does this say to us about the Father who has adopted you and me? First, adopted children are in no way less loved or less valuable to the parents. They have the same rights and the same responsibilities as family members that natural children have. The parents love them as much as children who are a product of the mother and father, and give them the same attention, affection and care; but the fact remains that the child is adopted, and that the people he is living with are not his natural parents. This is a reality that he must be made aware of, as he is able to grasp and accept it. And what about the feelings of the adopted child? I am sure that one feeling that is dominant is *gratitude*—"somebody loved me enough to take me into their home and make me part of their family!" Similarly, we have been adopted; the Almighty has made us his child, and the world's greatest Dad now bounces us on his knee.

Lessons . . .

When we ponder this notion of God's family, there are a number of lessons that we

find there. The most obvious one to me is that the fact that I am a member of the family is not because of any merit or goodness on my part. We have been born into the family by God's Spirit, which reminds us of our entry into our earthly families. Our parents brought us into this world without consulting us; they didn't take applications to find the person best suited to be their son or daughter, and they didn't go to a talent agency or an executive placement service. They got together and brought us into the world by their choice, and not because we were so groovy that they just couldn't turn us down. In fact, they got along well before we joined them, and could have continued to manage quite well without us. Looking at the adoption metaphor, adopted children are chosen to be loved and cared for, and not because they are so inherently good that it behooves the parents to adopt them. But, you may argue, we place our faith in Christ, and because of that faith were taken into the family. Yes, that is true, but we would be foolish to suggest that our faith somehow makes us *good enough* to be a part of God's family; all we did was make use of the mercy and good will of God by appropriating what Christ had already done on our behalf. The *only* way we merit our status as children of Yahweh is by virtue of the sacrifice of the Son of God for us, for we have all made it abundantly clear by our actions that we fall short of the standards expected of a perfect man or woman. It is by *grace* that we have been saved . . . thank God!

Further Considerations . . .

In a similar vein, it should be clear that our status as a member of the family is not affected by our actions. Perhaps I need to clarify this. Consider my experiences when I

was a child living with my parents. There were an awful lot of things that I did which were just plain dumb. I hurt my parents and undoubtedly baffled them a few times. I would mouth off, disobey, and do all of the other things that kids do at various times.

There was even one time when I decided that I didn't need my parents, that I was old enough to take care of myself. So, one afternoon, at the ripe old age of eleven, I set out to find my fortune and fend for myself. By shortly after sunset I was back home. Independence was too much for me. And, I should mention, my parents welcomed me home, but not without some disciplining. I could give other examples, but I think you can provide a few from your own experiences. The point is, no matter how bad I was, there was never a doubt in my mind that I was a son and a member of the family. There was nothing I could do that would be so bad that it could nullify that fact.

Even parents who disinherit a child, or claim that to them that child is no longer their son or daughter, are only fooling themselves; status as a member of the family is determined by the act of birth (or, in the case of adoption, legal action), and cannot be altered by anything the child may do. He or she may be a child who is out of favor with his or her parents, or who was thrown out of the house, or any number of other things, but that child is *still* a son or daughter. Similarly, I am God's child, a fact determined by Christ's act on the cross and my response to that, and my subsequent (or former) actions cannot nullify my status as a son of God.

It should be pointed out also that no person can take away my place in the family, no matter what position he occupies or what power he has. I cannot read you out of the family because you don't accept my philoso-

phy of Christian education, and you can't throw me out because I made fun of your toupee. This is not to deny that there is such a thing as church discipline, where there comes a time to tell somebody that he is wrong and needs to change; but what should be clear is that even if I am being disciplined, I am still a part of the family. You may choose not to eat with me or to adopt some other form of church discipline until I change, but I am still God's child and a member of his family, albeit a sinning child and a family member who is being lovingly disciplined by the church.

Like Brothers and Sisters . . .

When I think of the church as a family, some other things become clear to me. For one thing, we can be as different as is imaginable, and still be a part of the same family. My sister Penny and I are quite different. For one thing, she's a woman and I'm a man. We have different ages, tastes, occupations, and appearances. We live in different cities and different states. We don't agree on a lot of things, and I doubt that we could ever perfectly agree on anything. In spite of these differences, and a number of others, we are part of the same family. Why? Because we have the same parents. We shared the same home for many years, and we've shared many experiences over the years. There is a closeness there that is undeniable. We are brother and sister, flesh and blood, a fact that no amount of philosophic differences or physical distance can alter. We can be as different as we are, but we are still brother and sister.

This is my plea for the church today. If we are the church of Jesus Christ, the family of God, then I think it's high time we start acting like brothers and sisters. Note, I said

like *brothers and sisters*. I did *not* say that everything has to be peachy-keen, lovey-dovey and peaceful all the time. Maybe it should be, I don't know, but what I do know is that if we are going to be brothers and sisters, we're going to have disagreements, problems and squabbles. It was like that when I was growing up, it's like that in my family now, and I'm sure that's the way it always will be. What I would propose is that we recognize our problems as an inevitable part of adjusting to people who are different than we are, and *not* a reflection on anybody's sonhood or daughterhood. We may not agree on politics, expediencies, methods, techniques and interpretations, but, brother, what binds us together is a lot more important than what separates us! We've got the same Father, Lord, Spirit, faith, hope and baptism. We're part of the same family, brothers and sisters. I didn't have anything to do with your acceptance into the family—I wasn't even consulted—and I don't have any power over you now as a member of the Lord's family. What I *do* know is that we are brothers and sisters, something I neither understand nor fully appreciate, but something I recognize and accept. Someone has brought us together; who am I to separate us?

As with any figure of speech, if you press it far enough, it will lose its meaning. Probably the classic case of this tendency is Origen's attempt to allegorize the Parable of the Good Samaritan, where every detail of the story was said to stand for something, including the priest, the Levite, Jerusalem, Jericho, etc. By the time he was finished interpreting and allegorizing the parable, the original message was all but lost. And so it is with this metaphor of the people of God being a family. For instance, if we look for a mother for the family, we are probably off base, even though there have been a number

of candidates nominated for that position, including Mary (the mother of Jesus), the Holy Spirit, and the Bible. Similarly, the metaphor does not hold true in all points. One example concerns our place in entering the family: a child has no say over whether or not he will become a member of the family; we, on the other hand, have a choice as to whether or not we will be in God's family, and we can choose either way, at our own discretion.

Finally, as with many figures of speech, often the lesson will cut both ways. For instance, not only can I learn a lot about the church by comparing it to a family, but I can also come to understand what a family should be by looking at the church. For instance, my greatest example for a father-image is the Daddy who loves me in spite of

my raunchiness, and accepts me just as I am. I come to see what my role as a brother or sister is by considering Christians I have known who have shown me honesty, openness, vulnerability and empathy. Similarly, I learn dependence, sharing, joy and *agape* from people the Holy Spirit lives in. The examples are myriad, and I urge you to find some from your own experience.

I am still learning a lot about what it means to be a child, a brother, and a parent. This much I am sure of: I am a part of God's forever family, loved by the grooviest Dad around, and brother to some of the greatest people on earth. May God help us to accept each other as brothers and sisters, and, as a family, may we give all the glory and honor to him.

SO BE IT



A PRAYER FOR UNITY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

The Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one.

—Thomas Campbell

O Christ, too long Thy Holy Church has been
Divided; torn and rent with rancorous strife
O'er trivial things; too long has failed to hear
The dying prayer of Thee, who gave Thy life
The Church to purchase; somehow failed to see
That it is Thine; that to it all the ones
Whom Thou dost save are added; and that we
Are brothers each to each who are God's sons.

Help us, O Christ, who talk of unity;
Who proudly say we have no creed but Thee,
To see our creeds, unwritten—our deep loss!—
To shake them off, and in Thy liberty
Stand fast; as, once again, united, we
Call men to rally 'round Thy holy cross.

—DON REECE

Reflections on the Victims

TERRY OSMON

Flint, Michigan

West World is a current movie based on a relatively new concept of futuristic vacations: vacation resorts which are realistically reconstructed settings from history. The resorts are peopled by robots so perfect that they can scarcely be distinguished from resort guests.

All of your wildest desires and secret dreams can be fulfilled in perfectly computer-controlled settings by perfectly programmed robots whose sole purpose is to serve. The robots can be murdered, seduced and exploited, all with impunity—what's your pleasure? Best of all, these fantasy worlds seem so real, you can quickly forget they're not . . .

Until the day something goes wrong with the power center—the controllers lose control, and the robots go berserk. Guests are suddenly victims of the machines, and are pursued, tortured and murdered. The controllers are trapped in the control room when the electronic doors refuse to open—and they all smother.

The only human being to survive is the one man who could never forget that it was all artificial—the one man unable to embrace the fantasy. Ironically, the movie which begins in a crowded, ultra-modern travel agency, ends with one individual sitting on the steps of a medieval dungeon which had been part of the resort. The robots have driven him into a setting taken from the dark ages. The symbolism is obvious.

This movie, like so many others today, reflects the plight of a generation of men who have become victims of the machines

they created. In his book *Love and Will*, psychotherapist Rollo May says “. . . we move . . . to a ‘freedom’ that may not be a new expansion of consciousness at all, but a making of ourselves over into the image of the machine in a more powerful and subtle form.”

We live in a computerized world where the frustration resulting from the impotence of the individual erupts in violence all around us. In *Love and Will*, May also says, “It is this inner experience of impotence, this contradiction in will, which constitutes our critical problem.”

Thus we are confronted with the ultimate irony: that while man has harnessed even atomic power for his own purposes, the individual man seems powerless and at the mercy of his mechanized world.

Occasionally we hear the anguished question, “How can I be real in a world where even *people* are programmed?”

We dare not take the question lightly. Is there a way to be fully human in an automated world?

In Jesus, we have the emphatic “yes!” In following the one who was both fully human and fully God, we find the way to be totally real. We discover the significance of man in the realization that we were created in the image of God—to fulfill His purpose for us.

Robots? No. Human beings with a call to a purpose far beyond self-gratification. We who have answered this call and experienced this abundant life have a life-giving message for a dying humanity. □

Letters

Baptism in the Spirit

Craig Watts' study of baptism in the Spirit was especially timely and well done, I thought. It suggested some interesting new considerations which we will want to ponder.

One point still puzzles me, however. Watts apparently accepts the argument (along with Stott) that the Spirit is the *element* rather than the *agent* of baptism in 1 Cor. 12:13. He reasons that this conclusion is necessary by analogy with other passages where baptism *in* the Spirit is specifically mentioned. But this is begging the question since the matter of whether 1 Cor. 12:13 is analogous to those passages is the very point in dispute. It seems to me that the scholars who translate “For by one Spirit . . .” are justified in doing so by the context of the passage which repeatedly emphasizes things done *by* the Spirit, or *through* the Spirit (see vs. 4-11). Further, baptism *in* the Spirit makes the sense of verse 13 rather awkward, in view of the structure and phrasing of the passage. At least Watts' point does not seem to me to be as clearly beyond debate as he supposes.

Actually, much of the mystery of “baptism in the Spirit” might be dispelled had we not had “baptism” with all its sacerdotal aura foisted upon us by the king's translators and those who have followed their tradition. “Immersion in the Spirit” would be pretty clear in conveying the total envelopment of the human spirit in the Spirit of God. Such a blessed condition is begun, at least symbolically, at conversion, but realized more fully with growth and continuing submission.

But I began to commend Bro. Watts' article. My slight disagreement with one of his conclusions does not lessen my feeling that the piece is one of the very best of many on the Spirit that have recently appeared.

Lubbock, Texas

THOMAS LANGFORD

Regarding Craig Watts' essay in the December 1974 *Integrity*: The evaluation was interesting; some of the arguments hampered by the need to

cover more material than space quite permitted.

It isn't hard to agree with the article in the main, but the three passages which are used to “strongly support the view that *all* Christians receive the baptism in the Spirit” do not to me seem to support that conclusion even weakly.

Perhaps my prejudice is involved in this matter, but I have to evaluate this entire matter in the light of Paul's simple statement in Ephesians that there currently is only *one* baptism for the church, which I understand to be in reference to that baptism which unites us with Christ's death and new life—baptism in water because of faith and repentance.

Or perhaps it's just an objection to the terminology of “baptism in the Spirit” used in reference to other than Pentecostal gifts—the baptism which apparently occurred only twice in New Testament times, both prior to the writing of the Ephesian epistle.

Jesus requires a new birth as entry into His Kingdom. The first birth we each took part in required two creators. Jesus says the second does also. Just as the man's part in his child's birth supplements but does not exactly parallel the share taken by the woman, so spiritual birth may be thought of as joint action involving water and the Spirit—with new life created by seed (spiritual) “falling upon” good soil and in due time resulting in the actual “birth” in water. Water baptism, yes. Spirit “baptism,” not that I can see.

And Corinthian Christians as well as all Christians today have shared in one baptism, that is, water baptism which followed faith in Jesus. But most of the contemporary Christians of my acquaintance make no claim to having been baptized in the Spirit as the apostles were. Those who do claim baptism in the Spirit commonly base their claim upon an extraordinary “experience” (most often involving tongue-speaking), and are not apt to look upon their experience as “common”—quite the contrary!

Nor do I understand Peter as inviting penitent hearers to share what Christians today would usually think of as “Holy Spirit baptism.”

But however the study proceeds, for me it always comes against the firm rock of Eph. 4:4 whenever someone asks me to believe that two baptisms are necessary or desirable for those who live under the New Covenant—whether concurrent or deferred (as in a “2nd” or later “blessing”).

Baptism follows action of the Spirit, and can

accurately be said to be caused "by the Spirit"—if indeed it is *Christian* baptism. But to refer to the common reception of the Spirit as "Holy Spirit baptism" hardly seems necessary or desirable to me.
Joplin, Missouri

RAY DOWNEN

All in All

I have just been reading your beautiful editorial, "God With Us" (*Integrity*, December, 1974), which is by far the most inspiring piece of writing I have found anywhere this Christmas. Truly in Christ the Word did become flesh and dwell among us,—and in His living presence Emmanuel is with us today. How in the world did we get the idea that Christ should be divorced from Christmas? Thank you for a much needed and timely piece of writing.

Radford, Virginia

DON REECE

I appreciate *Integrity* for its challenge to my intellectual and spiritual thoughts and especially for its mission of integrity. Keep up the good work. Your three short editorials in the December issue were very rewarding and stimulating. Thank you.

Oakley, Kansas

TERRY NELSON

Playboy Philosophy in the Church

Integrity has been keeping "under wraps" one of its star writers. We should be hearing much more from Mrs. Ledbetter. Her reply to Janet Allison's defense of the subordination of women was searchingly and delicately devastating. Surely Mrs. Allison must realize that she cannot teach publicly thousands of male readers by permission of her husband if God's law prohibits a woman from teaching men. Either both she and her husband are in defiance of God's will or her assumptions about the "silence" imposed on women rest on traditions and culture in conflict with the freedom Christ brought.

Congratulations to Sarah Nelson for shooting down the hoary claim of J.J.M. Roberts that Adam had more value and dignity than Eve because he was created first. If that sequence argument has any significance, then the beasts of the field, who were created prior to Adam, have more value than man! The reverse argument that Eve as the final act of creation represents the highest and the best makes more sense if one wishes to indulge in the sequence business. Truly Mr. Roberts came off

second best in his claim that Eve's subjugation to man before and after the fall was her destined lot. If Eve's role as "helpmeet" meant subordination, then the Old Testament places God in the same role in Psalm 27:9! "Meet" merely means suitable and "help" carries no connotation of subordination.

God placed a curse on the serpent. The ground became cursed because of man's disobedience. He placed a curse on neither man nor woman. What happened to them was the consequence of their behavior. Those who find that Eve's curse was Adam's mastery over her overlook nicely one statement: "yet you will crave to have your husband." Surely they do not mean to say that woman's desire for her husband is a curse! In their fallen and alienated state both man and woman suffered. But in the fallen world, ruled by man's pride, woman did become exploited by man, particularly with respect to polygamy. The plural marriage and handmaiden system of the patriarchal age rested squarely on man's pride and appalling ignorance of biology—the belief that woman was nothing but the incubator of man's "seed." Freedom and restoration were proclaimed in the Nazareth charter. It is inconceivable that Christ did not intend to include women in his liberation.

If woman was inferior to man, why did Satan in the demonstration of his power choose to tempt Eve? Judging by the behavior of the two, Eve seems to be the superior. At least she challenged the temptation and weighed the consequences with intellect and feeling. Poor old Adam just took the apple and ate, and then acted cravenly by blaming his wife and perhaps even God—"the woman thou gavest me as a companion."

"God created mankind (*homo* in the Vulgate, a term inclusive of both men and women) in the image of himself . . . male and female (*vir et femina* in Latin, *arsen kai thelu* in Greek) he created them." Here they stand, not primarily male and female, but primarily *human, persona*, both in the image of God and both equal in the first commandment to be "fruitful, fill the earth, and conquer it." Here sex is secondary to *humanitas*, not *a priori* determinative, but one of the functions we are created to perform. We are not called upon to be true to our sex, but to our humanity. It is high time the church stop trying to outdo *Playboy* by treating woman primarily in terms of her sex.

Murfreesboro, Tennessee

NORMAN L. PARKS

Comment

from the editors

A REQUEST

About three years ago we sent a questionnaire to a sampling of readers, whose replies were very helpful. Now we feel it would be good to hear from our readers again. But this time we are asking all who will to write a critical evaluation of *Integrity* which might include such items as: articles you have considered particularly helpful (or which you have not), subjects which need attention (or more or less attention), writers from whom you would like to hear, and features of *Integrity* which you would like to see retained or eliminated. Criticize any aspect you wish, from paper to policy. We will give serious attention to each reply.

STATUS QUO

As the old year ended we received an unusually large number of letters of encouragement and enough contributions to pay up all our bills. In the face of this encouragement we are going ahead with plans to purchase our own addressing equipment. We do so reluctantly, for it means a big job and another financial burden, but we have no choice.

We thank all of you who have supported this work so generously and have given us so much encouragement. Receipts for 1974 contributions are being prepared and should reach you before this issue.

BARTCHY LECTURES

The first week of January *Integrity* was host to what we intend to make an annual affair, in which S. Scott Bartchy gave four

exceptionally stimulating lectures. Although a young man, Bartchy already is an outstanding scholar, and those who attended his lectures will be pleased to know that we are trying to arrange for him to return next year.

Serious students of 1 Corinthians and the social context of the early church will want a copy of his *First-Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:21* (in the Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series), which is an important contribution to the understanding of a difficult text and context. It is available in paperback (over 200 pages; \$4, including postage) from: European Evangelistic Society, PO Box 268, Aurora, IL 60507.

PURPOSE OF STATEMENT

This issue begins with a statement of purpose from our board of directors. Some, who have urged us to print one, will be happy we did. Others, who view such a statement as a step toward a creed, will not be particularly pleased. We would like to please everybody, but we can only hope not to displease anyone too much. We have no intention of writing a creed; there is too much of that going on already. Our statement simply spells out our goals as a publishing ministry and is issued in the hope it will give writers a sense of direction and encourage a higher quality of material. Preparing it was a profitable exercise for us, for it required each of us to give some sober thought to what our work is all about. We hope our high aims will not discourage new writers, for we have received some very fine material from people who were at first timid about writing.