

*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

APRIL 1978

# Integrity

**Editorial: William Barclay**

**What I Learned from the Hippies (2)**

*Judy Romero*

**Wanderings**

*Herbert A. Marlowe, Jr.*

**Super Sunday!?**

*Jim Reynolds*

**The Penalty for Dissent**

*W. Carl Ketcherside*

**The Problem with Models**

*George E. Cooper, Jr.*

**Book Reviews: "The Twisted Scriptures"  
and "Who's Who in Church History"**

*Hoy Ledbetter*

was nicknamed "Damned" Barebones). Perhaps a family like that should be immortalized, but most of the other 1,499 names in this reference work have better reasons than Praisegod for appearing.

Barker limited his selection to those who consciously thought of themselves as part of the Christian community, who had some effect on the ministry of the church, and who were no longer living. The last requirement, since this is a reprint of the 1969 Revell hardback edition, established 1968 as the cutoff point, which is why Barth and Brunner are included but Bultmann is not. But several people who died as late as 1968 are included, which makes this volume a handy supplement to the older ones many of us possess.

As we might expect, more space is de-

voted to Wesley, Calvin, and Luther, but respectable entries are accorded to closer neighbors of most readers of *Integrity*. Alexander and Thomas Campbell and Barton W. Stone receive above-average space. Sidney Rigdon is there, as is Disciples minister and journalist Charles Clayton Morrison.

The book is not without errors in fact (e.g., Martin Luther King, Jr. is said to have died in Nashville) and proofreading. But it is still a handy and valuable volume to have, especially in view of the price. It may be that most people will want to use it as a reference work rather than sit down and read it through, but I found it an interesting way to pass the time in waiting rooms or when I otherwise had a few idle moments.

—HL

APRIL, 1978  
Vol. 9, No. 10

Editor-in-Chief  
Hoy Ledbetter

Editorial Board  
David F. Graf  
Joseph F. Jones  
Dean A. Thoroman

Contributing Editors  
S. Scott Bartchy  
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

Subscriptions  
are by written request.  
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.  
Important: Readers  
who fail to notify us  
of address changes  
will be dropped from  
our mailing list.

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

Manuscripts  
written exclusively  
for INTEGRITY  
are welcomed.

Mailing Address  
8494 Bush Hill Court  
Grand Blanc, MI 48439

### WILLIAM BARCLAY

At one time I thought the most influential preacher among Churches of Christ was a Methodist named Clovis Chappell. The average listener did not know it, and probably had never heard of him, but his sermons were often preached almost word for word and were even shortened and disguised a little to become articles in the religious papers.

Then, in the early sixties as I recall, Chappell's influence began to be eclipsed by that of William Barclay, a Church of Scotland minister and teacher at the University of Glasgow, who died a few weeks ago at threescore and ten.

Barclay's numerous books have been widely read among us, and his material has often shown up in our pulpits. The last time I heard, his *Daily Study Bible* had sold 1½ million copies. His *Letters to the Seven Churches* has been the first resort of many of us for the past twenty years. His *A New Testament Wordbook* and *More New Testament Words* provided insights into New Testament Greek that could be appreciated by laymen and scholars alike. The list could go on and on, but perhaps the secret of his influence is best indicated in the titles of two works on the Sermon on the Mount: *The Plain Man Looks at the Beatitudes* and *The Plain Man Looks at the Lord's Prayer*.

Barclay successfully confronted "the plain man" with the profound lessons of Scripture. He was in close touch with both the modern world and the world of the Bible, and he made the gospel seem to belong to us. Although he was more liberal than many of his readers, he usually did not offend them because he did not dwell on the negative. His writings are worth studying not just for what he said but also for the way he said it. Every Christian teacher should read his *Fishers of Men*.

Whether we realize it or not, we as a people owe much to Barclay, and we will be much richer if, through his writings, he continues to live among us for many years to come.

—HL

INTEGRITY

## What I Learned from the Hippies (2)

JUDY ROMERO

*Ranchos de Taos, New Mexico*

### III. NEW NAMES FOR OLD IDEAS How to Witness to 20th Century People

"The trouble with you Christians," challenged a hippie woman, "is that you think you know everything."

Silently, I asked the Holy Spirit to give me the words that would speak to her heart.

"Well, I can't speak for other Christians, but I don't think I know everything. Why do you say that?"

"Because you're always putting down other religions that teach truth, just because Jesus didn't teach it."

"What, for instance?"

"Karma. You Christians don't believe in karma."

"Oh, but I *do* believe in karma, and Jesus taught it. The Bible says, 'Whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap.'"

"Then, don't you believe that reincarnation is the only answer to karma?"

"Reincarnation seems to be a good answer until you really think about it. For instance, in your own life, as you grow older, what is your experience? Is your personal karma decreasing or increasing?"

Her face flushed, and she started tapping her fingers nervously. She didn't seem inclined to answer, so I continued.

"If your karma is increasing in this life, then you will have to be reborn on a lower level, which will make it harder to attain to where you may have started in this life. Then if it increases in the next life, you end up on a still lower rung of the ladder the next time. The beautiful thing about Jesus is that, though he taught the reality of 'karma,' he also gave the solution, which is not reincarnation, but revitalization. Instead of putting the old person in a new body, he has the power to put a new person into the old body. That way karma is fulfilled, because the old person that sinned dies, through the death of Jesus, and the slate is clean. But better yet, Jesus moves into the old body along with the new person and gives you the power to become as perfect as he was and is."

By this time tears were spilling from her eyes. "I wish I could believe that, but it seems too good to be true."

"It isn't easy to give up the old person and life completely to Jesus. But when you do, I can't describe what joy and peace you feel as the whole load of karma leaves

APRIL, 1978

147

you. But it is real. I know, because I've experienced it. And you can experience it right now, today, if you want to."

At this point she hastily excused herself and left, wiping her eyes. I haven't seen her since then, but I know a good seed was planted in a sincere heart that day, and I will not be surprised to meet her on the great day of reckoning, born again and full of joy.

Jesus does not always speak King James English. Many Christians who wouldn't be caught dead speaking in tongues are guilty of speaking in an unknown language when they try to witness. Terms like redemption, grace, salvation, born again, church, faith, and repentance can be as alien to some people as if you spoke Greek to a peon. When Jesus was with farmers, he spoke in farming language. Paul said, "I have become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some" (1 Cor. 9:22). Until we learn to relate to people in their own terms, we'll never be as successful in soul-winning as Jesus and the apostles were. Francis Schaeffer points this out in his book *The God Who Is There*. He says the reason the church in the 20th century is not effective in its witness is because it is using words that have changed their meaning to the world since the 19th century. The term "God" means something completely different to an existentialist than it does to a born-again Christian. You may tell people they have to be born again, and they will agree with you if they believe in reincarnation, but you have established no communication.

There are two things necessary in order to be an effective witness today: information and inspiration. (Of course, the basic requirement is to have a living relationship to Jesus. If all you have is a set of laws to live by, then you really don't have anything better than the Zen Buddhist, and you won't be interested in witnessing anyway. Knowing *about* Jesus is not actually knowing *him*.)

### Information

It is not necessary to have a degree in philosophy in order to witness, but you must know something of what is happening in our culture today, other than what you hear in church. The degree of ignorance among normal church members is nothing short of astounding, in most places. I have even met Bible college graduates who didn't know who C.S. Lewis was. Most churches of Christ even practice a form of brainwashing against literature that, though not sophisticated, nevertheless is effective. The spiritual bogeyman threats used to corral any straying minds can only be called psychological thumbscrews.

In church and Bible college we were *told* what the other denominations believe. We were never encouraged to find out for ourselves by reading their material or seeking honest dialogue with Methodists and Baptists. (When I began to do this, I found I had been told some whopping lies.)

You don't have to be a scholar to find out what is going on in the world—or at least in your own community. There are more religious books and magazines for the "layman" on the market today than ever before. As one person put it, Jesus calls us to be *insulated* from the world, not *isolated*!

Personal dialogue is one of the best ways to become well informed, yet it is probably the least practiced among our people. In community religious activities, as well as community needs, church of Christ people just aren't there. Most street people have

never even heard of the church of Christ.\* When we confine ourselves to our own denominational circle of friends, we are running away from the very world Jesus wants us to win for him. If you never speak to your Baptist neighbor—or confine the conversation to worldly things—how will you ever know what he really believes?

Why is it that so many church members are actually afraid to talk to people about spiritual things? Why do they hide behind the curtain when a Jehovah's Witness comes to the door, pretending they're not at home? Why do they talk *about* the "dirty hippies" and drug addicts and alcoholics, and never attempt to talk *to* one? I believe (from my own past experience) it's because most church members have no answers for these people and they know it. The average J.W. has more doctrinal scriptures under his belt than they do. And Bible "sword fights" leave a lot of butchered corpses lying around without giving them new life!

Don't be afraid to break your mental and physical shackles. Read and talk and listen—to people *outside* your church. A faith that cannot stand questioning is a weak faith, if it's faith at all. Don't be too proud to learn. You cannot speak to a person in his own language until you know it.

### Inspiration

Information can help us relate to people, but information must be made alive by inspiration in order to bring real change to lives. If you believe Holy Spirit inspiration died with the 12 apostles (actually, 16 apostles are named in the New Testament), then please don't try to witness to unsaved people. It will only be a dry chore to you, with small fruit, if any.

Direct inspiration of your words by the Holy Spirit is a Bible promise to every Christian. In John 14:26 Jesus told the disciples that part of the work of the indwelling Spirit would be to "teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you." If that is true, then the Holy Spirit would remind them to teach this same promise to other Christians, because the Holy Spirit would remind them of Jesus' words in Matthew 28:20—"teaching them [all new disciples] to observe *all* things that I commanded *you*." One of his commandments to the 12 was to "not become anxious about how or what you will speak; for it shall be given you in that hour what you are to speak. For it is not you who speak, but it is the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you" (Mt. 10:19-20). Some of the commandments in Matthew 10 for that situation were later changed by Jesus, but not this one. In fact, he repeated it in Luke 21:15, in application to the end times. The apostle John well understood that this promise was for every Christian, because he later wrote it to "ordinary" Christians in 1 John 2:27. I can personally say that the greatest discovery one can make in the Christian life is that the book of Acts did not end, it just stopped. The reason so many church members are dying of boredom in the pews is because their Christian life is stale and dead. It is as we pour out the water of life to others that our own waters are freshened

\*Batsell B. Baxter was recently bemoaning the fact that so many of the young people are deserting the church. I have met some of them here in the hippie community. Of those who were converted, most were reconciled to their families, but not to the church of Christ. All but one that we know of went into other denominations.

and replenished. Let the church Pharisees argue whether or not this is for today, while you go out to the world and prove it true.

Words alone can do nothing; they have no power in themselves. But the Holy Spirit in us can infuse life into our words, with power to speak to hearts and bring them to repentance. Jesus explained the difference in John 6:63: "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life."

#### IV. HOW TO KEEP HANDS OFF

"So then neither the one who plants nor the one who waters is anything, but God who causes the growth" (1 Cor. 3:7).

When you're raised in the church, the main thing you learn is "how to do God's work." When God led me into ministry with the hippies, that was one of the hardest things to unlearn. I am still in the process of unlearning it. No one can "do God's work" but God. Somehow I thought God was "up there" and I was "down here" for the purpose of doing things for him—things that he was either incapable of or unwilling to do. This is guaranteed to get you a nervous breakdown. No puny human can usurp God's place. We can plant seeds and we can water them (as God provides the ground, seeds and water), but no amount of pushing, pulling, stomping, dissecting, analyzing or preaching can make them grow. Jesus said to make disciples and then baptize them. We turn it around and baptize them, thinking this automatically makes them disciples.

Peter said, "For the promise is for you and your children, and for all who are far off, *as many as the Lord our God shall call to himself*" (Acts 2:39). This is not teaching predestination, but that each man has a time in his life when he feels the call of God to get his life right, and until that time all the pushing down the aisle and dunking under water are useless works of the flesh. It is like putting a seed into hard ground. God is the one who calls to a heart to "break up your fallow ground" before the seed is planted. He brings the worker to plant the right seed at the right time. He brings a worker to water that seed. A lot of churches try to create a "hot-house atmosphere" to force growth of seeds, and all they end up with are a lot of wilted plants with no roots.

We often felt with the hippies as if God had left some helpless, abandoned orphans on our doorstep, and, frankly, the responsibility was frightening. It was like the day I took my first baby home from the hospital. At first it was great fun. But soon it dawned on me that the total responsibility for this new human being's life hung completely on me and my actions. No thinking person can take that kind of responsibility lightly. I became such a nervous, overly-attentive mother for a while that I'm surprised she survived. I did the same thing with the hippie young people. My maternal instincts came up roaring, aided and abetted with my past church training, and I'm surprised I didn't drive them out of the family of God before they got grounded. But thanks to the loving and patient teaching of the Holy Spirit, I soon learned when I was to do or say something and when I wasn't.

A newborn baby is a fragile thing. We know a newborn can't eat meat, but we sometimes try to pour too much milk down its throat and end up choking it. Some of the hippies had such a tenuous hold on their new spiritual life that too hard a push

could have sent them away from the Lord. We saw this happen with many well-intentioned Christians who would come to visit them, and end up preaching at them. Some hippies died spiritually with this kind of treatment. There were times when I was just aching to tell someone he shouldn't do this or that, and the Holy Spirit would tell me to wait and be patient. It was hard to do. But I was amazed how often that person would eventually come to me and ask for teaching on the subject I had wanted to talk about. Sometimes we want to deal with a person about drinking when he has rebellion in his heart. Once God deals with the rebellion, the drinking is no problem at all.

One day a girl who had been in one of my Bible studies came to me and said, "I've decided I want to be a Christian, but I don't think I can ever believe Jesus is as real as you say he is." We were sitting at my kitchen table, and the Lord inspired me to say, "If Jesus said he would be where 2 or 3 are gathered in his name, then he is right here with us now. If you could see him sitting in that chair next to you, what would you like to say to him?" I wanted to say a lot more, but immediately felt He wanted me to stop. So I waited.

And I waited. The silence stretched on and on. At first she looked skeptical. Then confused. Then shocked. Then she bowed her head and started to cry. At last she cried out, "Oh, Jesus, I love you so much!" and poured her heart out to him in prayer. That day she began her walk with Jesus, and I learned how beautifully Jesus can manifest himself to someone if we will just step back at the right time and keep our hands off his work (John 14:21).

Many more things I learned from my hippie brothers and sisters, but these four main things I have shared with you have become basic guidelines in my Christian life. I pray that they will also become a reality to you. □

---

#### WANDERINGS

Egypt . .

remembered as secure  
forgotten as enslaving

Canaan . .

ambiguous place  
land of promise  
filled with supra-human dimensions  
seemingly unscalable walls  
succoring milk and honey

Decision . .

forward to promise, to chance  
wander in the desert of indecision  
retreat across the Nile

. . . trusting in the promises . . .

—Herbert A. Marlowe, Jr.

## Super Sunday!?

I read somewhere that the number of violent crimes in Dallas County doubled on the Sunday following Super Sunday—January 15, 1978. Nobody worried—in America violence is only rated PG.

I wondered. “Do we watch violence because we are violent, or do we become more violent in the watching?” I got confused and punted into the grandstands.

I wondered about the meaning of an event staged by forces far beyond my control. Isn't a non-event turned into an event by the blitzing of powerful media people? Who gives away such power? “Oh my, I do!” Am I really responsible for my mind?

Because non-events become events when rich, beautiful, talented people say so, I find myself becoming very resistant, very cautious. How many non-events have I agonized over in a lifetime? How many Orange Crushes have I swallowed? How much cotton candy have I chomped on? No wonder I'm hungry for more, more, more—deep down—way down in me!

Does anything matter? Are there any real events? Do journalists and TV commentators cover all the real events? Do I have the means to find the event? To know one when I experience one? Don't real events demand involvement, joy, sweat, and tears?

A poor itinerant non-journalist whose TV set was never turned on, but whose imagination was teeming with life overcame death on a sleepy Sunday morning, after dying without a press conference on Friday afternoon with no mention on the Saturday night news. How odd of God to choose such a non-event.

Yet he is the EVENT! He doesn't call us to prime-time stardom, but to the smelly washing of feet, to non-violent suffering, to joyful sharing. He calls us away from rock'm sock'm, red-white-blue-and-gold religion. He says, “The one who is the greatest among you must become a non-event (in the world's eyes).”

Though he didn't wear a blue and gold helmet (he wore a cross), Jesus will be with us even when we lose ourselves in the immature rhythms of the pro-war. The world still longs for a mature Christian world—a world that has grown beyond Super Sundays to non-violent Resurrection love.

Events almost always include faith, pain, joy, service, participation, and costly loyalty. Non-events almost always include media deceit, violence, sexual manipulation, staging and man conformity to persuasion. American Christians, “Choose you this day whom you will serve and whose you will be!” Are you and I God's happenings or are we non-happenings waiting for one of the gods to call our number?

—Jim Reynolds

## The Penalty for Dissent

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

*Saint Louis, Missouri*

Before me lies a letter from a brother who wrote in deep distress. He had just received a cold epistle signed by the elders of the congregation where he had attended for almost a quarter of a century. He was charged with teaching heresy for stating in the adult Bible class one Sunday that he believed there were Christians in other groups besides “The Church of Christ.” He made no attempt to bind this view upon others. Nor was he given an option of publicly confessing that he had sinned in thus expressing his conviction or he would be excommunicated as a false teacher.

There was to be no opportunity for explanation or defense. He had been tried, condemned and sentenced in the hearts of men who would not even grant him an opportunity to plead his case. Such reprehensible conduct would not be tolerated in courts manned by pagans. “I told them that we Romans are not in the habit of handing over any man accused of a crime before he has had the chance of defending himself against the accusation.” So spoke Porcius Festus, a Roman governor. That the very opposite approach is indulged in by congregations made up of those who profess allegiance to Jesus of Nazareth is incredible. It shows they are far more sectarian in spirit than those whom they assail from protected pulpits and in partisan papers.

Whether there are Christians in other groups or not is not the real question. Rather it is whether one who holds the opinion that there are must button his lip in perpetual silence or express a lie to remain in the congregation. Must he be doomed to the somber silence of the sepulcher or to the fellowship of falsehood to be looked upon as loyal? Does one's salvation depend upon slavery to the unwritten creeds of uncharitable caretakers of orthodoxy?

The brother to whom I refer has lived in honesty and humility in the community. Not a word of scandal has ever been raised against him. As a teacher in high school he has shaped the lives of scores of students. He has attended the local congregation and patiently endured messages majoring in mediocrity. He has been generous in giving of time, treasure and talent. But all of that counts for nothing! He must now publicly renounce a deep personal conviction which commends itself as true, or be driven forth to be regarded callously as “a heathen man and publican.”

This is not reverence for the authority of the Christ. It is a return to the spirit of the Dark Ages, a reversion to the atmosphere of the Spanish Inquisition. It makes sincere dissent a criminal act, and thinking for oneself a heinous thing. It is bred of fear and nurtured in ignorance of the life and fruits of the Holy Spirit. And it will condemn a once glorious movement to extinction, stabbed to death by its own hand, slain with the keen-edged dagger of its own conformity.

What a tragedy that when even a recent pope threw open the window to let a little fresh air into the musty confines of Romanism, that our own brethren should be

stuffing the cracks with the mud of traditionalism to guarantee that the stifling stalesness not escape. Alan Barth in *The Loyalty of Free Men* said in 1951, "Thought that is silenced is always rebellious . . . Majorities, of course, are often mistaken. This is why the silencing of minorities is necessarily dangerous. Criticism and dissent are the indispensable antidote to major delusions."

It is not punishment to be excluded from a congregation where honest dissent is regarded as sacrilegious. You punish one when you send him to jail, not when you open the door and grant him his "walking papers." Archibald MacLeish said, "The dissenter is every human being at those moments of his life when he resigns momentarily from the herd and thinks for himself." May God deliver us from the herd-mentality! □

## REACTION

### THE CHURCH AS AUTHORITARIAN FISH OR COMMUNITARIAN FOWL: THE PROBLEM WITH MODELS

GEORGE E. COOPER, JR.

*Nacogdoches, Texas*

For some time, I have read Brother Norman Parks' writings in *Integrity* and elsewhere. It is obvious that he is intelligent, literate, and concerned about God's righteousness. Yet each time I read one of his essays I feel uneasy, troubled by his hermeneutic, his vague, questionable assertions, and the uncertain direction of his arguments. The most recent I have read, "Restoration and Models of the Church" (*Integrity*, August, 1977), is a case in point.

*EDITOR'S NOTE: Under the assumption that our readers are capable of thinking for themselves, we have always had a policy of publishing responsible reactions to articles which appear in Integrity. For various reasons consistent with editorial responsibility, we must decide against publishing some reactions, but we never do so because of any fear of our readers hearing the "other side." Although this article arrives at a late hour, it deals with an important subject of widespread interest and deserves careful reading.*

To begin with, Parks notes that restoration is the "very heart of the gospel . . . the burden of all Pauline writings. Jesus is the restorer." Then, after remarks about Christ's majestic work toward the restitution of mankind, he declares: "It follows that restoration has to do with people, not with institutional structure." That statement is the operative assumption of the article, and I personally find it a silly, moralistic, simplistic, and self-defeating antithesis. Adopting this approach, Parks equates institutionalism with hierarchical, authoritarian tyranny, which he wishes to see replaced with what he terms a liberating, (apparently) non-institutional, organic, communitarian model where all are equal.

Furthermore, Parks establishes two categories of worship and fellowship associated with each respective model. To the hierarchical model he attributes exclusionary, clerical, formal, rigid, traditional, un-

edifying, collectivistic, and liturgical qualities. By contrast, to the communitarian model he ascribes participatory, non-clerical, informal, responsive, creative, edifying, communal, and spontaneous tendencies. Parks thus sets "people" off against an "institutional structure"—Good against Evil, Spirit against Flesh, *Gemeinschaft* against *Gesellschaft*.

### Dubious Categorization . . .

I am dubious of such a black and white categorization, though I would not deny that within the Restoration Movement all kinds of ugliness, meanness, greed, insecurity, and authoritarian traits—that is, carnality—have been institutionalized. Certainly, the egregious examples cited by Parks are all too frequent within the Churches of Christ. But when Parks maintains that the authoritarian model is the "chief cause" of the woes and abuses within the Movement and that they would not flourish in the warm atmosphere of communal love, I have to be skeptical. The fault, it appears to me, is within each of us, Dear Brutus. For I am hard put to see how either of Parks' models, once operational, can escape being institutional.

The hierarchical model Parks sketches is patterned after American corporate structures and is primarily concerned with stability, balancing of budgets, organized programs, and careful management and growth. Clearly, he does not approve of this model, claiming that it is unbiblical and, hence, squelches real fellowship. On the other hand, Parks' equalitarian, organic, mutual ministry model (which he says flatly is the only biblical model) "revolves around the indispensable ideal of building one another up, of ministering to each person's needs, and, on the whole, of developing an intensely personal relationship among the body of believers." The first two points he makes here about edification and service are reasonably clear enough and seem to apply to the activity of the *ecclesia* (though I wonder what one

is to do if one's authentic spiritual needs are best ministered to by the dignity of "high church" ritual, liturgy, and formality. Is that to be imagined? Or must the activity of the assembly take place within the breezy atmosphere of either a Chamber of Commerce or a communal informality?).

But his third point is vague, misleading, and, quite frankly, psychologically chic and threadbare. What does Parks mean by "an intensely personal relationship"? Does he mean a strong, emotional attachment? If he does (and I think he does), then I must object on the grounds that not even Jesus in the flesh developed "intensely personal relationships" with all his twelve disciples. The Gospel of John, in particular, indicates a favored three among the twelve and that Jesus' "heart warmed toward" Mary, Martha, Lazarus, and the rich young nobleman (Lazarus again?). This, of course, does not mean that he did not love the others, though they (even the favored) sometimes felt neglected and responded jealously. It means that Jesus was more closely attached *emotionally* to Peter, James, and John, and to Mary, Martha, Lazarus, and the young nobleman. The kind of "intensely personal relationship" found in the church is an *agape* relationship which may include the emotional *philia* and *eros* but which may also transcend these. In the last analysis, *agape* or charity is dispassionate and is the only form of love permitting us to care for those whom we find unpleasant, hateful, and contentious. To quibble: if Parks means that in Christian *koinonia* we are all equally sons and daughters of God, that we ought to depend on one another, and that we are to share Christ with one another and thereby strengthen one another, then he ought to say so clearly.

The organic model Parks wishes the twentieth century church to adopt (institutionalize?) strikes me as a collection of informal college experiences venerated over by a good old boy revivalistic informality

and egalitarianism—that is, as a faculty social, classroom seminar, hand-holding hootenanny, coffee shop poetry reading, and outdoor devotional all rolled into one moving experience. It is, it seems to me, professorially fuzzy-headed, amorphous, directionless, and, in its own way, as exclusive as the corporate model. Both models—and I have personally known fellowship in a variety of both—may or may not lend themselves to edification, to service, to charity. But if the corporate model pictures the church as an authoritarian, brutally managed business enterprise, then, to my mind, the organic model conjures up the image of an amoeba. And this leaves the believer who rejects both in a quandary. What is one to do if *in good conscience* he can approve or accept neither? Is he to go to hell?

#### My Preference . . .

Fortunately, through God's infinite mercy and by the sacrifice of Christ Jesus, men have come to know our Lord's grace and salvation and have received the blessed Spirit within a variety of institutional contexts. But even making allowance for the fact that Parks' models are what the German sociologist Max Weber called "ideal types," I personally would prefer other, less abstract, more humane, concrete alternatives. Both his models scarcely exemplify the full-blooded Body of Christ foreshadowed in the Old and spoken of in the New Testament. My preference is toward the more Biblical and traditional metaphors of Christendom: the church as mother, bride, chaste virgin, family, brotherhood, flock, army, kingdom, city, body (which Parks does utilize), and so on. The church is mysteriously all of these—and much more—certainly more than a secular, Procrustean model.

As far as I can tell, model-building preoccupied neither the Lord, his apostles, nor the great cloud of witnesses who trusted in God from the beginning. And

contrary to Parks, I see little evidence in the New Testament that Jesus "flatly rejected" the principle of hierarchy or that the kind of *ecclesia* Paul sought to encourage was necessarily "a *koinonia* of equality, voluntary interdependence, and full participation and responsibility." Christ, after all, was constantly reminding Pharisee, scribe, and disciple alike, not that they were equal, but that they ought to show mercy, to love and to submit humbly to God and man, lest they think themselves something when they are nothing. We must respond to Christ's imperative today. But to submit implies the acceptance of higher and lower orders, of hierarchy, and not the acceptance of the equalitarian presumption that "I'm as good as you."

Indeed, as Paul wrote in Philippians 2, the church's mission is submission. And that implies a reversal of conventional *hierarchy*. The King of the Universe became a servant in order to make his servants kings. The notion of equality is, in fact, decidedly impersonal and rationalistic, a secular distortion of Christian relationships. It is an idea that smacks of the Deistic, geometric world of Newton and Locke—numbers being equal in certain cases, individuals never, not even identical twins. We are, no doubt, all equally mortal and sinful; we shall all bend our unequal knees before a majestic but merciful Sovereign who judges us not equally but with justice and compassion. We certainly ought to love our neighbors as ourselves, but that has little to do with the legalism of equality. Loving one's neighbor as one's self, if taken literally and without spiritual qualification, encourages all sorts of uncharitable behavior, not *koinonia* but spiritually bland mutual admiration societies, the "I'm OK, You're OK" syndrome of Laodicea. We (our selves individually and collectively) are not the measure of charity; Christ is. He is kingly and loving because he can submit in humility to all men; he submits to all men because he is a loving King.

In his Corinthian and other epistles, Paul delivered (in addition to his theology) not an eternal constitution for an egalitarian, communitarian church, but practical suggestions regarding the correction of abuses, for administration, and for pastoral guidance appropriate to each congregation. To regard Paul's advice as a direct constitutional command from on high, subject to universal application in every age, is uncritical literalism of the worst kind. The church in the first century apparently consisted of rather *ad hoc* congregations held loosely together by wandering apostles and guarded by God's merciful providence. She was institutionally primitive, diverse, weak, and informal, but institutional nonetheless. And despite His mercy, she was often carnal-minded and played the harlot, as the New Testament epistles attest. Indeed, Paul's admonition to the congregation at Corinth was for each member to draw on Christ's grace to overcome carnality and immaturity with charity. In that way, the Body would become institutionally stronger with all things being done "decently and in order" for the benefit of all.

#### Of Necessity . . .

I fail to see why some of my brethren have this *thing* (a deep-seated antinomian, gnostic fear?) about physical, sensual churchly institutions. And I am convinced that, deny it though we may, we *shall* have creed, clergy, liturgy, tradition, and church government—implicit or explicit, formal or informal, poor or excellent. Some may, like Brother Parks, attempt to banish them from our religious life, but they will return quickly enough. Before

long, even the most Spirit-filled assembly will begin to regularize its meeting times, its spontaneity, its teaching; it will recognize its better teachers and preachers; it will opt for a division of responsibility and labor (as did the Jerusalem church); it will formalize to a greater or lesser degree its leadership; and it will look back after a number of years to its fond memories, practices, and to its views about God, and—lo!—it will be an institution with a tradition. It is inherent in the history of Christianity as well as the history of the Restoration Movement.

In short, the church possesses a living history. And though the church is not of the world, she will of necessity be worldly but not necessarily carnal (authoritarian, enthusiastic, bland, or libertine). To rework the words of James Madison a bit: men, even regenerate men, are not angels and, hence, require government—ecclesiastical and civil (Rom. 12, 13). It is high time, it seems to me, for the Restoration Movement to acknowledge honestly that it has and must have, despite denials to the contrary, all the institutional forms common to Christendom: creed and clergy, liturgy and tradition, authority and government. It is not a question of having or not having these things; we shall have them regardless, for they are a part of living in this world. The question is rather whether we shall have a true creed; a wise and exemplary clergy leading by serving; a liturgy which is lovely and edifying; a tradition which with a godly firmness binds the faith of our fathers to the faith of our sons not yet born; and an ecclesiastical polity adorned with the imperishable garments of charity, and wholly submissive to her Lord and Husband. □

#### WOMAN'S PLACE IN CHURCH ACTIVITY

If you would like a copy of *Woman's Place in Church Activity*, a 36-page paperback by Norman L. Parks, send \$1 to Amos Ponder, 1269 Pickwick Place, Flint, MI 48507.

## LETTERS

### More on Preachers' Salaries

According to a recent survey conducted by Restoration House, Inc. (see *Christian Standard*, Sept. 4, 1977), the average preacher's salary was \$13,756, with the highest reporting at \$22,800.

According to a booklet entitled, "Supporting an Effective Ministry" published by the National Council of Churches, the average salary in 1973 was \$10,348 representing 19 denominations. This was an increase of 51% over the past 10 years. Since that survey is 5 years old I realize that there have been increases. If salaries have increased 51% in the past five years that would still only represent an average salary of \$15,625 annually.

I'm sure that someone has made a survey like this among non-instrumental churches of Christ. Please enlighten us with some figures to substantiate your claims.

JOHN OWSTON  
Peach Creek, West Virginia

EDITOR: I have no argument with Mr. Owston's figures, but my statement that a preacher *may* earn from \$500 to \$700 a week related to the high end, not averages, and, although it is based primarily on what others tell me, I do not doubt its accuracy. Last year an unskilled worker's *starting* package in a local GM plant was \$12 an hour, including benefits but without overtime. That *some* professional preachers make more than unskilled workers should not surprise us, but that the average preacher in the survey Owston cites makes \$10,000 less than unskilled workers raises some embarrassing questions.

### Abortion and the ERA

In his article "Houston: The End and the Means" (Jan.-Feb., 1978), Norman L. Parks said, "The ERA has nothing to do with abortion . . ." Anyone who suggests that it does is, in his terminology, using the "big lie" technique. While granting that there has been an excess of prattle on both sides of the ERA dispute, there is more to be said about ERA and abortion.

Senator Sam J. Ervin in a letter dated Sept. 22, 1975 wrote, "I think there is no doubt of the fact that the ERA would give every woman a constitutional right to have an abortion at will." Professor Joseph P. Witherspoon of the University of Texas Law School in a telegram

dated Jan. 9, 1975 said, "Ratification of the ERA will inevitably be interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States as an explicit ratification and an approval by the people of the United States of its 1973 decision invalidating state anti-abortion statutes and of its declaration therein that the unborn child is not a human person whose life is protected by the Constitution—Ratification of the proposed ERA will also make it much more difficult for pro-life forces to obtain submission, and ratification of a Human Life Amendment." Professor Charles Rice of the University of Notre Dame Law School in a letter dated Jan. 21, 1975 said, "If the ERA were adopted, it would make clear beyond any doubt that the states would be disabled from prohibiting or even restricting abortion in any significant way . . ."

And if one thinks these are not clear enough, Betty Friedan, a well-known writer and founder of NOW, when asked about the relationship of ERA and abortion she replied, "As for reliance on future Supreme Courts—that's the reason we need ERA" (May 14, 1975). Sarah Weddington, an abortion lawyer in the Roe v. Wade case and a Texas ERA leader, testified that enactment of a Human Life Amendment is in conflict with the ERA principle that women have a right to "all choices." By "all choices" she includes, of course, abortion. Dr. Thomas I. Emerson of the Yale University Law School and a leading proponent of ERA said, "I think that the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, while it would not affect the abortion situation directly, would indirectly have an important effect in strengthening abortion rights for women" (letter, Jan. 15, 1974).

As Norman L. Parks has told us, "The words of ERA are easy enough to understand" and "ERA is perhaps the clearest and simplest amendment ever proposed for ratification." What is not clear and what Christians should be concerned about is not what the ERA amendment actually says, but the way in which it will be interpreted by the Supreme Court. We are all only too well aware of how the Supreme Court can read strange ideas and notions into parts of the Constitution, ideas which no one has ever seen for decades.

It is already believed by many pro-life groups that there are precedents for federal rulings that denying abortion would constitute "sex discrimination." It has been pointed out that a HEW regulation read into the Education Amendment of 1972 the obligation to finance abortion. What will the government do with ERA? Brother Parks may call my concern "canned and mostly preposterous arguments . . . coming out of the preacher's study," but he cannot guarantee that passage of the ERA will not lock into the Constitution the right for abortion-on-demand. Until the mood of the Supreme Court and the federal government changes and such can be guaranteed, then I am opposed to ERA because of the abortion issue.

STEVE WILLIAMS  
Frankfort, Kentucky

## REVIEWS

### FOR SUFFERING SAINTS

*The Twisted Scriptures* by W. Carl Ketcherside. St. Louis: Mission Messenger, 1977. 200 pages, \$3.25, paper.

During the past quarter of a century I have rubbed elbows with a large number of saints who have never been really happy in their church life simply because they insist on having an unstrained fellowship. Such people cannot be satisfied unless everything is smooth, easy, and pleasant. But what they expect is totally unrealistic. Ignoring the Biblical demand for patience and forbearance, they build castles in the sky, then try to move into them, bringing calamity upon themselves and their fellow Christians.

I have also encountered a good many preachers who, I believe, are in much the same situation Paul was in when the Lord seized him: they are kicking against the goads and finding it hard. In their saner moments they are tormented by their disposition to erase from the Book of Life those benighted souls who do not pass all of their doctrinal tests. Yet, like Paul, they are conditioned by training and association to carry on suppressive campaigns, even to distant cities.

Paul is a good example of what God can do with a man of integrity whose orthodoxy compels him to fight against the right way. A modern example is Carl Ketcherside, who, by the way, also saw the light on a journey abroad. His book details the sort of confrontation with the Scriptures which will bring such restrictive people to their senses.

"The twisted Scriptures" to which the title refers are those passages commonly used, in controversies more or less peculiar to the various Churches of Christ, to

justify refusing to associate with brethren because of differences over inferences and deductions from Scripture—such passages as Amos 3:3, Galatians 1:6-9, Mark 16:15-16, 1 Corinthians 1:10, Romans 16:17, 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 1 John 1:7, 2 John 10-11, 2 Peter 1:1, and Jude 3. The people to whom the book is addressed will not need to look the passages up; they know them by heart. Yet much of the material is of value to a wider audience.

Ketcherside shows how the aforementioned texts are taken out of context and distorted in order to maintain a stance toward other Christians which is the very opposite of what the Lord intended. He also, instead of being merely negative, demonstrates what the passages really mean, and outlines the kind of attitude we should have in our brotherly relations. A concluding chapter acknowledges the need, in some cases, for avoidance and discusses three valid reasons for it.

This book, which so far has very little competition, needs to be widely read by those who imagine themselves to be walking in the steps of Campbell and Stone. It may be extremely helpful to those of us who are yet to learn the full meaning of patience and forbearance or who must continue to live with brethren intoxicated with exclusionism. It may be ordered from the publisher at 139 Signal Hill Dr., Saint Louis, MO 62121.

—HL

### WHO'S WHO

*Who's Who in Church History* by William P. Barker. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977. 319 pages, \$2.95, paper.

Although he never spoke or made any contribution to it, Praisegod Barebones made his claim to fame by lending his name to Cromwell's "Little" Parliament. He had a brother named Christ-Came-Into-The-World-To-Save Barebones. But even worse, his Puritan parents named another brother If-Christ-Had-Not-Died-Thou-Hadst-Been-Damned Barebones (he