1976 CHRISTIAN LIFE COMMISSION SEMINAR PROCEEDINGS

SOUTHERN BAPTIST HISTORICAL
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES
Nashville, Tennessee

$2.50

Foreword

The Christian Life Commission scheduled its 1976 annual seminar on March 22-24, 1976 in Washington, D.C. for several reasons. The nation's capital was deemed the most appropriate possible place for holding such a convocation in the year of the Bicentennial celebration. The 1976 presidential election especially focused national attention on the capital city because of its highly visible inhabitants and would-be inhabitants. Moreover, the proximity and availability of national leaders from both Congress and the administrative branch of national government made Washington the best setting for bringing speakers to the 1976 meeting.

Some 689 persons registered for this seminar on CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP '76. They came from some thirty states and were characterized by exceptionally diverse origins, professions, interests, and persuasions. There was, however, remarkable unanimity among the participants concerning the importance of involvement by Christians in the political arena where we all have much at stake. The registrants heard and then entered into dialogue with some twenty outstanding program personalities who brought their professional expertise to bear on many of the vital issues of our time.

The addresses from this seminar on CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP '76 are provided in this printed form primarily as a reportorial service to seminar registrants. The speakers prepared these addresses for oral presentation to a live audience. Therefore this material should not be judged as if it had been carefully written for formal publication in book form. It is hoped, nevertheless, that these printed addresses will enable both those who were present in Washington and those who were not present to learn from these famous and remarkably able men and women who addressed themselves to various dimensions of CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP '76.

Special acknowledgement and thanks are due to the Christian Life Commission staff persons who worked long and hard to make this Bicentennial seminar especially significant: Floyd A. Craig, Mrs. Gaye Eichler, Mrs. Jean Elledge, C. Welton Gaddy, Mrs. Annette Hayward, Harry N. Hollis, Jr., Mrs. Faye Russell, and Mary Elizabeth Tyler.

We hope these *Proceedings* may substantially enlarge the impact of the seminar on CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP '76.

Foy Valentine, Executive Secretary
The Christian Life Commission of the
Southern Baptist Convention

Table of Contents

Proceedings of the 1976 Christian Life Commission Seminar "Christian Citizenship '76" held in the Statler Hilton Hotel Washington, D. C. March 22-24, 1976

SUBJECT PAGE

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP '76: Program Orientation

C. Welton Gaddy

Why another meeting related to the Bicentennial? Seldom, if ever, has a celebration been so thoroughly talked about by scholastics, maliciously maligned by jokesters, self-servingly cited by politicians, brazenly exploited by profiteers, colorfully placarded by the media, carefully programmed by planners, and generally ignored by the masses. Meetings convened around Bicentennial themes have proliferated with a rapidity akin to the production of red-white-and-blue trinkets. Why another meeting related to the Bicentennial?

The Christian Life Commission is genuinely hopeful that Southern Baptists will grasp any enthusiastic interest in the affairs of the nation precipitated by this historic year, and channel that interest into educational programs which define the responsibilities of a citizenship consistent with the comprehensive nature of the Christian mission and into political action persistent in the implementation of that which is morally right. Faithfulness to the gospel which we are charged to proclaim is redemptively beneficial to individuals as good news and positively consequential to society as good deeds. An authentic ministry of evangelism such as that entrusted to us is both personal in that it is directed toward people and undertaken for their well-being and political in that it takes seriously the world in which people live. Our prayer is that Southern Baptists may honor God in the political precincts of civil government even as in the religious realm of ecclesiastical polity and that this seminar may be of some help at that very point.

Permit me to share with you a perspective on this meeting.

"Christian Citizenship '76" is motivated by biblical-theological truth. We focus on Christian citizenship in 1976 because nearly two millennia ago our Lord entrusted to his people a ministry of salt and light which is to penetrate the structures of government even as every other segment of life. The blessings of committed citizenship in the Kingdom of God are complemented by demands for responsible citizenship in the kingdoms of this world. Rendering to Caesar what is Caesar's in a democracy embraces knowledge of political processes, sensitivity to critical issues, commitment to the moral use of power, expertise in exerting influence, and persistence in priority involvements. Such skills ethically exercised are integral to, not diversions from, rendering to God what is God's.

"Christian Citizenship '76" is convened and will be conducted in a spirit of authentic patriotism. Without apology we confess a love for this nation which finds expression in a desire more firmly to establish that which is right in the republic and boldly to challenge that which is wrong. With a deep sense of gratitude we recall our forebears' willingness to sacrifice security in behalf of liberty even as with sadness we witness our contemporaries' willingness to sacrifice liberty in behalf of security. With pride we point to the centrality of justice in the ideals of our national documents and with frustration we note the prevalence of injustice in the realities of our national experience. With thankful hearts we speak of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" and with troubled consciences we suspicion a government "of the corporation, by the corporation, and for the corporation." With joy we consider the importance of religious faith in the shaping of the nation and with despair we witness the importance of a civil faith in the shaping of religion. Would that every participant in this meeting could be worthy of the words which William Butler Yeats penned about a friend: "He was a patriotic man who . . . gave his country not what it wanted but what it needed . . . a kind of perpetual last day, a sound of trumpets and a summoning up to judgment."

"Christian Citizenship '76" is structured for the dissemination of information and the provocation of enlightened dialogue. Positive influence on such matters as inflation, health care, public education, unemployment, civil religion, and national priorities is dependent upon accurately informed consciences. Admittedly, our program is full. Many speakers will interact with you on a variety of topics discussed from diverse political perspectives. Please train your ears to discern the word of truth. As much as possible, set aside prejudiced labels, pierce deafening stereotypes, and distinguish fact from opinion. The price will be disciplined attendance during the six sessions of the seminar and a tired mind. However, the result may be worth it. Out of such deliberations in the past have come refinements of truth which served as the foundations for significant decisions about the future.

"Christian Citizenship '76" is intended to encourage a renewed commitment to and personal involvement in influential citizen action. We harbor no illusion about building a "Christian nation"—a concept untenable in biblical theology and unrealistic in political philosophy—but we are committed to exerting a Christian influence within the nation. Legislative proposals which affect the moral climate of this land should never be discussed without input from the Christian community. No advocate of justice and no proponent of liberty should ever have to stand alone so long as there are Christians in the neighborhood. Political action for the people of God is not a matter of a passing fad but a matter of an enduring faith.

Welcome! Please permit the presentations of these days to inform your intellect, challenge your will, excite your emotions, and motivate you to action, thereby nurturing your Christian commitment. Carefully consider the viability of all that is said. Disagree with statements when you must. Affirm ideas when you can. Engage in the kind of thoughtful reflection on responsible citizenship which will reach far beyond the confines of this room and result in concrete expressions of Christian ministry.

We are glad you are here. May our journey together be a good one through "Christian Citizenship '76."

IN QUEST OF COHESIVENESS

William E. Hull

If, while we were rebels, we were reconciled to God through the death of his son, it is all the more certain

—now that we have been reconciled—that we shall be saved in his life. And not only that, but we are also rejoicing in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the reconciliation which we received is a present reality.

—Romans 5:10-11

All of this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the task of reconciliation, which asserts that, in Christ, God was reconciling the world to himself, refusing to reckon men's sins against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. Therefore, as representatives of Christ we do the work of an ambassador, convinced that God himself pleads through us. On Christ's behalf we beg of you, "Be reconciled to God!"

—II Corinthians 5:18-20

For he alone is our peace, he who made both groups (Jew and Gentile alike) into one and destroyed the dividing wall which formed a barrier of hostility between us. During his earthly life he also annulled the Law understood as "rules and regulations," in order to fashion the two groups into one new humanity in union with himself, thereby achieving peace, and to reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, on which he put to death the hostility between them.

—Ephesians 2:14-16

He is the source of life, the first to return from the dead, that he alone might become supreme in everything. For the entire fulness of God chose to dwell in him and through him to reconcile everything upon earth and in heaven unto him, since he made peace possible through the blood of his cross. At one time all of you were alienated, hostile in disposition which you expressed by evil deeds. But now (God) has effected reconciliation through the death (of Jesus) in his physical body.

—Colossians 1:18b-22a

I have never been able to decide if there is any intrinsic significance to nice round numbers. For example, we are currently awash in that media ballyhoo which some call the Bicentennial celebration. Well and good, but should we be one whit better citizens this year than we were last just because on one rather arbitrary way of reckoning our national birthday, the calendar has finally rolled around to the nice, neat 200th year? I am going to answer that in the negative and to aver, almost defiantly, that I intend to be, if anything, a bit *more* patriotic next year just because that will have to suffer under the fate of being our 201st anniversary!

I have engaged in this opening bit of playful debunking in the hope of making a useful point. Those of us gathered here are not going to be serious about America's destiny, at least not automatically so, just because we are gathered in the capital in a Bicentennial year. Some of you are already exhausted, if not jaded, from the incessant demands of the speaking circuit to come up with one more God-and-country talk while all the bunting is still tacked in place. It will take an act of fresh commitment, an act of will, an act of conscience, to fill these days with the kind of soul-searching, that intense concern that will overcome the Bicentennial blahs! Unless we are careful, we will spend forty-eight hours gaping in public, tittering in private, and name-dropping back home about those luminaries that our program committee is going to parade across this rostrum.

On the surmise that all of us want more than that, I have tried to take seriously my assignment to bring biblical and theological perspectives to this auspicious agenda. We find ourselves in a time of fragmentation when the cohesiveness of the national enterprise is threatened by competing factions. Those famous lines of William Butler Yeats have become painfully true of our post-Indochina, post-Watergate era:

Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;

Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world; . . .

Therefore, I propose that we work here in these seminar sessions at mending the broken center, searching for those reconciling realities that foster a sense of wholeness rather than of alienation in our corporate life.

To do this, I shall begin this afternoon with a biblical analysis of the reconciling gospel as it was developed most profoundly by the Apostle Paul. This evening I shall move from the biblical to the theological, from the exegetical to the topical, by sketching a systematic framework in which we can understand the implications of this biblical truth. Then, on the basis of this conceptual foundation established in two sessions today, I want to spend all of the three sessions on Tuesday in an intensive examination of three perennial polarities in American life: (1) in the morning, tradition versus innovation—that is the conservative versus the liberal if you don't understand that rhetoric; (2) in the afternoon, absolution versus ambiguity—that, of course, is the fundamentalists versus the critics; (3) and in the evening, particularism versus universalism. Since the last of those cleavages is the one generating the greatest single antagonism at the moment, I shall devote the final session on Wednesday morning to an in-depth look at three facets of that in the areas of race, sex (women's lib, you know), and vocation.

Now today, if we were to ask, what is that mood that has generated the deepest concern, it is the mood that there is a kind of dissolving, a kind of fragmenting pressure that is tearing at our common life. I am suggesting that the Apostle Paul faced a world like that where, particularly in his later Gentile ministry with the incipient gnosticism of the Greco-Roman world, he came face to face with a kind of alienation, "a failure of nerve," as our Baptist forebear Gilbert Murray called it, which caused him to formulate the gospel in four decisive passages in a way that is foundational for the insights that we need here. I have collected those passages—Romans 5:10-11; II Corinthians 5:18-20; Ephesians 2:14-16; Colossians 1:18b-22a—on a green sheet of paper which you need to retrieve from your packets. For those who want intensive study and have enough seminary background, or whatever, to work in the language of Paul, on one side of this sheet there are these passages extracted and printed in Greek. For those who prefer the English equivalent, I have sought to offer my own contemporary translation, laboring a

bit for exactitude, on the other side, the very same material. So, everybody can look at the same sheet. There is no status involved in whether you prefer Greek or English; there is not even a page one or a page two, but you need to have the Bible in front of you in the form of this green sheet of paper. These are the four passages in which the verb or the noun "to reconcile" or "reconciliation" occur. That word has somewhat been anglicized like *koinonia, agape, ecclesia,* and so forth—there is a magazine probably found in your town called *Katallagete,* a word meaning reconcile. That is a very simple word, The *allaso* or *allage* is just the *allo* meaning "other." *Kata* means to exchange one thing for another which is simply a very basic word for "transformation." To be reconciled refers to a transformed relationship in which something, which we will soon see is the Christ relationship, is put in place of the alienated relationship.

I want to summarize what I think these four passages teach with three points. I have been in the pastorate now long enough to organize my comments that way, and I want to say two things somewhat in dialectical tension under each of these three points. If you would like to sketch in your mind or on paper an outline, the first thing I want to talk about is the source of reconciliation.

I. It is quite clear from these passages that in sharp contrast to the world of his day, Paul is affirming that reconciliation invariably initiates in God. In the first passage from Romans (5:10-11): We were reconciled to God through God. We are rejoicing in God through whom the reconciliation was received. God is the source. Or in the Second Corinthians (5:18-21) passage: All of this is from God, who reconciles us. Or, a little bit later in the same passage, it was God who in Christ was doing the reconciling. On and on we could go through the passages to point out that it is invariably the divine initiative which stands in contrast both to Judaism and Hellenism. Here is a radical notion unfamiliar to the ancient world. We are reconciled *to* God *by* God. Now, because Paul always said that, the object of the reconciliation is man. Always God is the subject; always man is the object. Never once did Paul suggest that man, by what he does, by what he thinks, or otherwise himself initiates reconciliation. Instead, as you can see in the first Romans passage, the last line, it is God through whom we received the reconciliation. If you want to ask, what can man do, the answer is he can be receptive; he can be open; he can be vulnerable to discovery by a reality which he has not created or nourished.

So, I think it is important to begin by saying that man cannot create or sustain reconciliation. According to the first passage, he was a rebel. The very first line of Romans 5:10: "If while we were enemies (RSV)," *rebels,* flaunting a flag in the face of God that says that we were sovereign. Or again, in the next passage in Second Corinthians (5:18-21): While we were in trespass or sin. Or in Colossians (1:21) near the bottom, "And you, that were sometimes alienated," hostile in your disposition. So, Paul goes out of his way to suggest that man was precisely in the opposite disposition from that of seeking a cozy relationship with God. Now, hold that in mind for a minute because we will come back to it. The source of reconciliation stems from God and is for man, as it were, against the grain of man's disposition. It is God overcoming man's hostility.

II. Now, let me make a second point and that is to talk about the scope of this reconciliation. Because, if man is going to resist, to be hostile, to be an enemy, it might suppose that God would look for the few who would have a favorable inclination toward himself. But, instead, you will see in these passages the sharpest emphasis on the universality of God's reconciliation. And the two points I want to make about this is, first of all, that its potential is cosmic. That begins from what we were just saying; namely, that man is enemy. The minute Paul says that reconciliation is for God's enemies, that is his way of saying that it is for everybody; because, for example, in Romans he had just spent most of chapters one, two, and three defining the universality of man's enmity. If you ask how many of us are hostile, the answer is everybody. The emphasis on hostility is Paul's universalizing concept. The universal indictment is the universal opportunity. The universal wrath of God is the dark backdrop against which to see God's incredible grace.

Now, Paul emphasizes this in various ways. I said that the potential of this reconciliation was cosmic. It is actually that word, that Greek word, *cosmos,* which he uses again and again. In the Second Corinthian passage (5:18): "God was in Christ, reconciling the world"—the cosmos, the universe, if you please—"unto himself." Or if you look at the Ephesians (1:26) passage, almost two-thirds down: In order that he might fashion the two groups into one. Well, what are these two groups? They are the Jew and the Gentile, and in the ancient world, that was everybody. They simply divided up the whole human race into the Jews and the non-Jews, and it is those who are going to be made into one new manhood, humanity, race, if you please. In Colossians the term that is used is even more sweeping, I think, and breathtaking than the word *cosmos,* or world. In the third line of the Colossians (1:20) passage, I have translated it "and through him to reconcile everything." That is the Greek phrase *taponta,* which means the all, the everything, the totality. And he goes on to say in this very passage, "It's everything on earth and it's everything in heaven"—once again a totally universalizing concept. Therefore, when we step from these passages, there is no way to avoid the strong conclusion that Paul intends to assert the implications of reconciliation for the totality of human existence, the totality of the created order, the totality of the all, however spaciously it may be conceived.

But I said I wanted to say two things about the scope. In dialectical tension with its cosmic potential, we have to say that reconciliation is actual, not in the cosmos, but in the church. In every one of these passages on the *cosmic* scope of reconciliation, there is operative a dialectic of decision. For example, in the first passage, it is for enemies which means it is for everybody, but the last line says, "it is only us," the ones confessing, the ones belonging to a self-conscious community "that affirm we have received" it. It is for every enemy but we who "rejoice in God," we who have our Lord Jesus Christ, we are the ones who know we have it. Or take the Corinthian passage. Right where Paul says, "he has reconciled the world unto himself" as an indicative fact, he turns right around in the last line and says, "we must beg the world to become reconciled" as an imperative necessity. From indicative fact the world

is reconciled, imperative necessity pleads "be reconciled." Or in the Ephesian passage, even though he intends to make both groups, Jew and Gentile, into one, it is ony those who are in his body, those who are in union with himself that have achieved peace. And on and on we might go. Basically in every passage, there is not only the assertion of a universal sweep, but there is the acknowledgment of a core of confessing individuals.

Now, let us reflect on this for a moment. What does it mean? I shall never forget the American Baptist Convention virtually spent five years of theological energy with their evangelism leader, Jitsuo A. Marikawa, because he kept saying that God reconciles everybody. This is not easy to understand. And, here by the way, if you are American Baptist, I am not giving Marikawa theology; I am giving Paul's. How do we understand the fact that Paul wants to say "everything" and "everybody" is reconciled is an indicative fact but there is no imperative greater than extending that reconciliation to enemies? First of all, this is the way of saying that the divine act of God in Christ Jesus is all sufficient. It is a way of saying that there is nothing else for God to do, that there is nothing more that God needs to do, but that it is coupled with the contention that every man must existentialize this act of God for himself in order to make it effective, in order to make it something that you rejoice in, in order to make it something that has an "our Lord Jesus Christ" to it. Only the community of faith confesses that it is reconciled, for the church is what we may call the realm of realized reconciliation. But, even though the church is that sphere in which it becomes operative, the church never knows itself as the favored few who have done something somebody else hasn't done which makes them deserve a special status. The church can never from Paul say that it and it alone has been reconciled.

As I was saying, talking to one of the reporters, I can never look out the window even as I rejoice in my reconciliation and say that God has done something for me that he has not done for that lady I saw walking along in a white raincoat. I can never meet the enemy, the foe, the stranger for whom God has not done as much as he has done for me. Therefore, the emphasis initially falls on the finality of God's act on the boundless universality of his grace and then, subsequently, equal emphasis is laid on the imperative of faith as a witness to this reality. God does the reconciling. We proclaim it.

III. That leads me to the last thing I want to say. We have talked about the scope of it. We talked earlier about the source of it. Let me conclude by speaking of what Paul calls the service or the ministry of reconciliation. Now, it is quite clear for Paul that Christ is the unique agent of reconciliation. Every text indicates that if you know Greek, there is the little preposition *dia,* through, agency; and all of these passages are just filled with *dia's.* You can go through on the Greek side and mark one after another. Through the death of his son, through him we now have reconciliation, reconciled through Christ, in Christ, because of Christ. Every passage has that with a particular emphasis that it is through his death. But beside that, it all comes through Christ, there is a parallel emphasis on the service of the Christian. The unique finality of the death of Christ does not mean that God's reconciling activity is concentrated exclusively there. Rather from that fixed point, that ultimate indicative where God said, "It has come to pass," "It is done," "I have acted," "Christ has finished." From that indicative there comes an ongoing process. The Corinthian passage, I think, makes it clearest. In verse eighteen, "He did it in Christ but he entrusted to us a message of reconciliation"—that is a word. Only God can cancel trespass but we can bring it to sound, we can say it, *logos*—we can give it a word. And Paul describes that ministry of the word in the last sentence by saying, "We are ambassadors" on Christ's behalf, begging men to be reconciled to God. Now, this means that Christians do not reconcile anybody. You see books entitled *The Reconciling Church.* Rather, Christians point men to the One who does reconcile and they say this clearly because they have become authorized representatives of God. Now, the significance of that for a theology and then for a contemporary practice is what we will seek to spell out tonight.

WHOLE PERSONS IN A BROKEN WORLD

William E. Hull

I am aware that some have arrived since the opening, and since my six-part presentation is a tightly knit series, let me use three sentences to recapitulate so that we will move forward in hopefully a tightly knit chain of thought.

What I tried to do this afternoon in an overall series on the reconciling gospel in Paul was to suggest that first of all the event, the fact, the givenness of reconciliation has its source in God as subject, the One who reconciles its object in man; and to suggest that because the object of that reconciliation is man in his enmity, hostility, rebellion, that it extends to all men potentially and is realized in the concrete fellowship of the church. For that reason based on the finished work of Christ, those in this realm have a ministry or service by which they bring reconciliation to sound, to word, to proclamation, beseeching as an ambassador.

Now, let me introduce what tonight I hope will be a theology building, a systematic formulating, a constructing effort. Let me introduce that by beginning where we were with one last look at the green sheet that has the Scripture passages on it and talk about the significance of that reconciliation, the enduring reality and results of the work of Christ. Now, the reality can be stated, in one word and that word is "oneness." A synonym would be unity. And the Ephesians passage is the one which points this out again and again. You can simply underscore the number of times there that the word "one" is used provocatively. It begins by saying, in verse fourteen, that Christ has made the two world groups, basically the insiders (Jews) and the outsiders (Gentiles), *one;* that being *one* is the very essence of the new thing. That quickly is defined in verse fifteen as being *one new humanity* or mankind. In verse sixteen and on to verse eighteen (which is not included on your sheet), there is the indication that this unity is in *one body* and, later, that we have access through *one spirit.* So, there is a oneness of fellowship, a oneness of body corporateness, and a oneness of permeating spirit which

means that basically unity is the reality we are dealing with. But that unity has to be given content. Remember that Adolf Hitler fused the German people into a sense of oneness they had not known since Bismarck. You can be diabolically one. Therefore, Paul goes on to describe (and we will stay with the Ephesians passage far beyond the limits of the three verses I gave) to speak of the essential content of that oneness, the results of it, as being peace and joy.

Now, this is presented, as it were, dialectically; that is, by means of contrast. Paul had said (and you can look at the Romans passage—5:10-11), "We were enemies"—rebels, hostile, our fist up in the face of God—"but now we rejoice." The word is almost the one for lyric ecstasy. If you can imagine a fist-shaking rebel, in mutiny against all of the powers that made him and sustained him, now leaping and clicking his heels, as it were, for joy. But as I said, this is worked out in Ephesians, chapter two. If you happen to have a copy of the Bible, and I will not ask how many copies are in the room, you might want to jot this down. In verses eleven through nineteen, which is the total paragraph for Ephesians, chapter two that we are dealing with, there are six characteristics of what we once were and six characteristics of what we are now. Paul has a way of saying that "once" you were (and he describes it) but "now" (it is a very emphatic form) is a characteristic formula for B.C. and A.D., a kind of existential before Christ and since Christ. Picking them out, let me mention in my own paraphrasing what we once were so that you can begin to see the composite character or flavor of it. "Once" (in verse twelve) "you were estranged, you were excluded or alienated." Also in verse twelve, "you once were without a Messiah, a strand of hope; once you were without God, hopeless, Godless, Once you were sojourner, transient." So we have six things: estranged, aliens, without hope, without Messiah, without God, sojourners. These are the characteristics of the B.C., before reconciliation.

Then, he says (and here are six things in verses fourteen, fifteen, and seventeen, all in my own paraphrasing): "Now you have peace." "Now you have access." "Now you are no longer a foreigner." "Now you are no longer a sojourner." "Now you are a fellow citizen." "You are members of a household." All right, these are the six characteristics. But Paul does not try to line up each of the six and say, "B.C. and A.D."—before and after, to state them theologically. As you read through the passage, you can see three or four correlations that his mind is working on. Basically, he says that in reconciliation we have moved from exclusion, from a lack of standing or belonging, to citizenship. One of our speakers today talked about the vocation of being a citizen. That is a role, a life. So Paul said that although you were once excluded, now you are accepted. Another correlation is clear: Once you were an alien, now you are a household member.

There is not time in this setting to give illustration, but I wish I could convey the visceral feeling of what it was like in 1962 to live, for one year, eight miles from the Iron Curtain during the Cuba crisis knowing that in a sudden social panic, if those forces massed fourteen kilometers from my house were unleashed, I would be an alien. I would be a stranger. There is just no way to describe the fundamental difference in being at home and being an alien with a flimsy passport when chaos erupts. This means, therefore, basic to all of the images that Paul uses in talking about reconciliation, the most basic is that the outsider has become an insider. He has now become an insider to a new state, citizenship; to a new homeland territory; to a new family with a Father God. The warmest image we have is my country, my land, and my home, blood, soil, flag. These are the things that Paul said now belong to those who are reconciled. Therefore, from this what do I conclude are the essential ingredients in a theology of reconciliation?

First of all, we must understand that reconciliation introduces a person into a fundamentally changed situation; that is, he now has relationships that he did not have before. Notice how unlike justification or even redemption, which are different images, the image here is a relational one. I am now tied to a country. I am now tied to a homeland. I am tied to a family. I am block mortiсed into a growing human temple. So, there is a fundamentally altered relationship. Now, what is it?

I like to speak of what I would call in Paul the alienation syndrome as it would be contrasted with the reconciliation syndrome. Or you could use the word "gestalt" or the word "life-style." Basically the alienation syndrome is one of mutiny, of hostility, of being an enemy, of being in civil war; and it is precisely the stance of the alien, the hostile, the rebel, the mutineer to be alone. There is an aloneness that separates the person from the connecting tissues of life. Therefore, the real issue that we are coming to is one of identity. You do not know who you are because you are defining life only by what you are against. You are against God's laws. You are against his character. You are against his people. You are against his promises. And because of that, you don't know who you are. You don't have any soil in which to sink your roots. That is what it means to be alienated.

Thomas Merton once said: "To be alone from God is entirely too much loneliness." And this is what Paul was saying. Now, over against that, he set the reconciliation syndrome. What is that cluster? It basically emphasizes that man has now come to peace, to a kind of inner core of poise that is rooted in the fact that he belongs to something transcendent. He belongs to God. He can live in God's world as his territory. He belongs to God's family. He has a new sense of identity. He knows who he is because he is connected; he is related; he has a people.

Now with that as a kind of core descriptive statement, let me use the last half of my time to talk about why I think this is an adequate theology on which tomorrow I am going to try to be intensely contemporary and try to make rather sweeping applications. Those applications will fall to the ground unless they rest on a sufficient theological foundation. Let me tell you why I think that reconciliation is adequate. I will play on words here. I think it is adequate because it reconciles some of the cleavages in our theology which tends to make it shaky, and I will name three of them.

First of all, a theology of reconciliation—that is the understanding of a Christian event like this—reconciles the tension that is so often in theology between point and process. As you well know, many theologies are transactional and others are developmental. There is no way that you can make a theology of reconciliation

one or the other. On the one hand, it is a theology with a point. For the Greekers: Reconciliation is God's aoristic action; that is, it is something in which he gathers eternity into an hour and focuses it on the human situation. It is a given. It is a done. Paul, looking back on the whole life of Christ, states it as a single act or fact. He came and made peace. It is done; he made it. It is given. All of our verses state reconciliation as an action that is accomplished. Therefore, here is a given, fixed, focused, final point which breaks the cyclical, endless, repetitive nature of existence. Not only does that point alter the possibility of human history just rolling on with endless wars, and the rise and fall of civilizations; it has been altered, it has been bisected, it has been divided, it has had something done to it. That is also true of my personal history. I have now a B.C. and an A.D. I have now a before Christ and an after Christ. Therefore, I do not just cyclically spin through life like a little animal in a squirrel cage, Reconciliation is a point at which God decisively declared in Christ a reality that transcends the divisions with which I was hopelessly enmeshed.

But, in this very formulation, the point is also a process. The aoristic action is also a durative action, for this reconciliation must be heard. I must keep bringing it to word. The reality must become the *logos*. He has given us the *logan*, word of reconciliation. It must be received. The last verse of the Romans passage (5:11, RSV) says that we rejoice in the "reconciliation" which we received. It keeps becoming a demand and a challenge and a future orientation by which I narrow the gap between the little clearing in the church and the cosmic potential which is out there. In other words, I never run out of a frontier on which to announce the reconciliation possible in Christ. So, I am ever set in tension, even as I have the unalterable confidence on which that tension rests. I have reconciled my being and my becoming.

Second, a theology of reconciliation also reconciles the tension between personal and social. I would think that those of you who are closely affiliated with the Christian Life Commission would be very attentive here. As you know, Southern Baptists typically polarize themselves between a personal gospel of evangelism and a social gospel of community action and the like. Reconciliation is intensely personal because it deals with my identity, with my relatedness, with the ground in which I can sink my roots. Therefore, always an individual is related to God. This is as evangelical as any way of stating theology. It is personal. It is the theological equal of justification or redemption at the personal level, but unike justification and redemption, which, as you well know from Lutheran and other theology, can stay intensely individualistic, almost Kierkegaardianly subjective, reconciliation is inescapably social because I am in relationship. Notice the way the Ephesians (2:16) passage says: "We were reconciled *in* one body *to* God." That's it! To God is what the personal evangelism people are always saying. *In one body* is what we are insisting on in our corporate solidarity, our social responsibility.

I have time to mention the last one. A theology of reconciliation also reconciles the tension between creation and redemption. Always, apparently, we are fated to live with the gnostic alternative right at the edge of our thinking by which we are in danger of losing a healthy understanding of creation. Now, by saying that God has reconciled everything; to say that he has reconciled the cosmos, world, universe, is a way of saying that God has taken seriously the ultimate unity of creation, foreshadowed, of course, in the protology of Genesis and in the eschatology of Revelation. That is, he has determined to make Christ the constitutive core that holds the universe together, to give in Christ the meaning by which all our meanings will cohere. Therefore, I must take seriously the entire created order because that is the scope of reconciliation. But, at the very same time, reconciliation comes through personal redemption; it is discovered, appropriated, existentialized by faith. At present it is hidden to the world. The world does not understand the secret of our common life; therefore, it lives in an eschatological tension. It is realized incipiently, latently, poleptically (that is a good word). It is realized in advance in the life of the people of God. But that is a banner, that is a token, that is a rebel flag raised in the face of the world. The church must be concerned for all creation precisely because by its redemption it has anticipated the goal of all creation.

Now, if that is at all true, I am going to try to suggest tomorrow some of the profound ideological battlegrounds on which in this world order we shall seek to state the implications of a Christian theology of reconciliation.

THE ORDEAL OF CHANGE

William E. Hull

One of the most pronounced tensions in contemporary life is between those committed primarily to a preservation of our heritage and those open to the hope of something better. The former group stresses continuity while the latter group advocates change. Those in the first camp magnify the importance of structure while those in the latter camp extol the virtues of spontaneity. The most common labels used to describe this polarization are "conservative" and "liberal." As these terms imply, the conservative seeks to preserve his cherished beliefs from change or destruction while the liberal seeks to overthrow those restrictions which would hinder man's growth and progress.

For some, these differences should be resolved by a fight to the finish. Conservatives have called for the "silent majority" to rise up and slap down a "noisy minority" of liberals, while liberals have talked darkly about "realigning" society in order to remove the blight of reactionary conservatism. But these strategems represent "final solutions" which assume that there is not room for both sides creatively to coexist because the two tendencies are contradictory and thus mutually exclusive. Ultimately, the issue is whether reality is restricted to only one of these viewpoints or whether it is broad enough to embrace them both.

To answer that question let us look to four sources of insight: biblical, historical, theological, and practical.

I. Biblical

In both the Old and New Testaments there are numerous examples of those committed to a preservation of the past. Early in Israelite history, when the twelve tribes settled in Palestine, a group called the Rechabites clung to a preference for the earlier nomadic way of pastoral life and so set themselves against the more sedentary agricultural pattern which brought great changes to Israelite society (Jeremiah 35). In the crisis of the exile, when circumstances again seemed to alter drastically the shape of Jewish life, men such as Ezra and Nehemiah led in a restitution of the old ways which would preserve unchanged the pattern of worship built around the Temple in Jerusalem. In the New Testament, the book of Acts tells how James found himself at the head of a Jerusalem congregation determined to perpetuate its continuity with Judaism by the enforcement of circumcision and the offering of animal sacrifice (Acts 21:20-24). Biblical examples abound of those who were clearly "conservative" by virtue of their concern to resist innovation in periods of drastic upheaval.

At the same time, there are equally clear examples of "liberals" intent upon reshaping the past in order to create a new future. In the time of emerging monarchy, Saul united the tribal confederation into a nation despite the reservations of more cautious spirits such as Samuel. In response to Babylonian captivity, the exilic Isaiah, plus the authors of Jonah and Ruth, called for a sweeping redefinition of Israel's mission in terms of a universal witness to the Gentiles. In the New Testament, Stephen was so impatient for radical changes in institutional structures, some of them more than a thousand years old, that he managed to get himself stoned after only one sermon on the subject (Acts 7)!

From the total evidence we must conclude that there are clear, even rather extreme, examples of both conservatism and liberalism within the Bible. The freedom with which both tendencies coexist together is further clarified by a recognition that the greatest figures in Scripture show a remarkable blend of both. Can we really say that Jesus himself was either "conservative" or "liberal"? Did he not bear witness to both sides of the issue in a single sentence when he said, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets [conservative]; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them [liberal]" (Matthew 5:17, RSV)? Or take the apostle Paul: could he have been more "conservative" than in his willingness to undergo ceremonial purification and to sponsor Jewish sacrifice (Acts 21:23-26), while at the same time making the "liberal" demand of freedom from circumcision and equality of table fellowship for his Gentile converts (Galatians 2)?

Everywhere in the Bible we see a creative balance of both perspectives. The New Testament was faithful to the Old Testament, yet it went far beyond it in both letter and spirit. The Gospels were bound to the single story of Jesus, yet free to interpret it creatively in at least four different ways. Paul was determined to preach only one gospel, yet the form which it took was flexible indeed (e.g., Galatians and Romans vs. Colossians and Ephesians). The Bible favors neither the conservative nor the liberal position but embraces them both in dynamic equilibrium.

II. Historical

As in Scripture, so in the long pilgrimage of the church, both conservative and liberal tendencies have been at work. It is sufficient here to observe the mischief that is caused when one emphasis is allowed to prevail to the exclusion of the other.

Conservatism, on the one hand, has often caused the church to cling to the past long after it should have been discarded. In the patristic period, for example, the doctrine of creation was developed around a Ptolemaic view of the universe. When Copernicus and Galileo shattered that understanding with their new discoveries, the church succeeded only in making a fool of itself by its refusal to face the facts, thus leaving a permanent blot on its record which still confuses the proper relation between science and religion. Again, in the medieval period, the church adopted a traditionalistic approach to the interpretation of Scripture which lacked that sense of history necessary to understand ancient documents. With the rediscovery of antiquity following the Renaissance, both Catholics and Protestants were lamentably obstinate in defending their outworn methods and so let the leadership in biblical study pass from the church to the university. Once more, only a little over a century ago, our Baptist forefathers in the South stoutly defended the institution of slavery because it had existed from time immemorial, ordained in the earliest sections of Scripture. Thus did they allow one of the greatest moral advances in history to pass them by and bring shame on the ministry from which it still has not fully recovered.

At the same time, liberalism has just as often found itself advocating new causes which fail to produce what they promised. Many future-facing optimists thought that colonialism would open the door to a worldwide evangelization of the heathen in one generation, only to discover bitterly that the missionary does not flourish best in the vanguard of Western imperialism. With the advent of psychology some supposed that we would soon uncover, classify, and control the hidden passions of men, only to find that our psychopathologies are more rampant today than ever before. Some "old liberals" in the twenties became so enlightened that they thought we could demythologize the demonic and dispense with its somber view of human nature, only to awaken to the satanic hell of Hitler's Naziism and the apocalyptic threat of atomic warfare. More recently, many churchmen optimistically supposed that the technological revolution would usher in an age of abundance within our land, only to find that the factory has fouled our environment, decayed our cities, polluted our streams, and threatened our very extinction. Just as we have clung too long to tired traditions, so we have prematurely embraced many a passing fad.

The lessons of history are writ large for all to learn. Conservatism by itself becomes mere antiquarianism which condemns us to live in the past, impervious to needed change. Liberalism alone becomes mere novelty which condemns us to live for the future, impervious to those continuities from which we get our roots. It is just as foolish to say that the best has already been as it is to say that the best is yet to be. The answer, quite obviously, is to be so open to the future that we can unload the excess baggage of the past, yet so open to the past that we can sift the passing fancies

of the future. Far from choosing between these two tendencies in a win/lose fight to the finish, each is indispensable to the other for balance and restraint.

III. Theological

The lessons of church history are also reinforced by the very structure of Christian doctrine. Central to our faith, of course, is Christology. Unlike Judaism, however, which bequeathed to us the messianic idea, our understanding of Christ is divided into two parts which we may call his First Coming and his Final Coming, in theological terminology his Incarnation and his Parousia. Because we look back to his First Coming we are a community of memory, but because we look forward to his Final Coming we are a community of hope. The Christian lives in "three-dimensional" time. In addition to the present, he identifies profoundly with the past by affirming, "I have been crucified with Christ." At the same time he identifies equally with the future by singing, "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord." A deliberate balance between conservatism and liberalism is maintained by affirming that "this same Jesus" who once lived on earth will come again (continuity), yet his Final Coming in exaltation will be dramatically different from his First Coming in humiliation (change).

According to the Gospel of John, Jesus himself labored to define this balance in the upper room with the disciples on the eve of his departure. Realizing that there were many things which he had not yet been able to share with them, he promised to send the Holy Spirit who would "lead them into all truth." This ministry of the Holy Spirit means that the Christian must forever be liberal in the sense of openness to the surprises which God has yet to disclose. At the same time, Jesus emphasized that the Paraclete would be "another" of the same kind as he had been (John 14:16), that in the Spirit's coming he himself would come back to them (John 14:18, 23), that the Spirit would not speak on his own authority but would "take what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:13-14). In other words, the Spirit would draw out in the future what was already latent and implicit in the past. That is why the Christian must always balance his study of the Book which records the First Coming with a sensitivity to the Spirit who is the anticipation of the Final Coming. In so doing, he is like the householder of whom Jesus spoke "who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old" (Matthew 13:52, RSV).

Implicit in these careful theological formulations lies a profound philosophical issue. Long before Plato and Aristotle, Parmenides argued that all change is illusory, transitory, imperfect, and unreal. As the apostle of the eternal and the unchanging he laid the foundations for conservatism in both religion and politics. At the same time, another philosopher named Heraclitus saw reality as a flowing river, at once the same and yet different. To him everything was in constant flux and change. Thus did he become the harbinger of liberalism throughout the centuries. Christianity cannot choose between these philosophical alternatives because it knows that Christ is "the same yesterday, today, and forever" while, at the same time, it knows that he makes all things new. Reality must be grasped both at a point and in a process, both in its simultaneity and in its successiveness, both in its being and in its becoming, both in its recurrency and in its originality, both in its continuity and in its change.

IV. Practical

One reason why we have magnified both of these emphases in our theology and philosophy is because they correspond to the practical realities of human nature. It is not surprising that the old are more naturally conservative, while the young are more naturally liberal. It is only common sense for the old who have acquired a sense of history to cherish it, and for the young whose lives are still before them to reach out for the unclaimed tomorrow. If we intensify the conflict between conservatives and liberals, we may succeed only in widening the generation gap and alienating the young from the old.

Again, our social settings in space are as diverse as our ages in time. Some live in village hamlets where history seems to stand still, where the rate of change is so slow as to be imperceptible. Others live in burgeoning cities where the rate of change is blindingly fast, where the tried and true techniques of yesterday become obsolete overnight. No wonder that rural man is often a traditionalist while urban man is often an innovator. For one group to condemn another simply because it does not understand the setting in which it lives is to risk a sociological fragmentation which could be disastrous.

Once more, as a matter of personal temperament, some are cautious about change because they are not skilled in the techniques of experimentation. They may lack that type of intellect, training, and stimulus which makes men bold. At the same time, it should not be surprising that the highly educated who feel secure in their knowledge are sometimes willing to risk more innovation. Our educational institutions where men work with ideas are often centers of change, whereas the workaday world where men work with things is often a laboratory of caution. Surely we are not shut up as Christians to the politics of confrontation between the eggheads and the hard hats. Few will possess the versatility of a Paul who "became all things to all men," but at least we can recognize and glory in the variety of emphases needed if the church is to bear clear witness to the conviction that it lives where the ages overlap (1 Corinthians 10:11).

For myself, to the chagrin of those determined to pin labels on preachers like tails on donkeys, I intend to be both conservative *and* liberal. I shall choose in each situation whether to be preservator or innovator by means of an explicitly Christocentric criterion. That is, whatever I find of Christ in my heritage, that tradition I shall tenaciously conserve. Likewise, whatever I find that will give fuller expression to Christ than heretofore, that potentiality I shall just as tenaciously seek to liberate.

This does not mean that I wish to straddle some ideological fence, or to live only for the moment oblivious to a past I cannot affirm or a future I cannot accept. Andre Malraux said of Charles DeGaulle, he was "a man of the day before yesterday and of the day after tomorrow." In that spirit I propose that we become *more* conservative than most, protecting not only the legacy of the last hundred years but also the treasures of the past to the dawn of God's dealings with the Patriarchs. Likewise, let us become *more*

liberal than most, preparing our generation not only for tomorrow but for the day after tomorrow. Church and nation alike need not less but more memories and more hopes than ever before. Only with this combination of rootedness and openness will we negotiate the vast ordeal of change that is the terror of our times.

THE CRISIS OF COMPLEXITY

William E. Hull

One of the deepest differences dividing us today is between those concerned for a few simple convictions which may be embraced with certainty and those determined to take seriously the complexity of life. Typically, this polarity has been described as the warfare between "fundamentalists" and "critics." So bitter has the controversy become, however, that neither side is willing to accept the label hurled at it by the other side. Since nobody wants to be called a "fundamentalist" or a "critic" we must try to understand and employ these familiar terms without their pejorative connotations.

Turning first to the dictionary, we discover that "fundamental" comes from the root *fundus* meaning "bottom," signifying a concern to get to the bottom of things, to discover the base or underlying ground on which reality rests. That which is "fundamental" is that which is "primary, foundational, necessary, indispensable, irreducible, the root of the matter," especially "one of the minimum constituents without which a thing would not be what it is" (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, p. 921). The word "critical," on the other hand, comes from the root *krit*, meaning "to discern" or "to judge." That which is "critical" is that which involves judicious evaluation, reasoned opinion, discriminating analysis and exacting discernment (*Ibid.*, p. 538).

Based on these intrinsic meanings rather than on peripheral connotations suggested by excesses at either extreme, we find that the desire of the fundamentalist is to identify minimum essentials, to cut through complexity, to eliminate ambiguity, to define absolutes. The critic, on the other hand, by the very definition of his task is seeking to make distinctions, to analyze reality in its several aspects, to elaborate on an issue by showing the many relativities that are involved. In actual practice, the fundamentalist attempts to clarify truth by reducing it to a few simple statements, while the critic tries to clarify truth by exploring its many ramifications. Viewed spatially, fundamentalism is driven by the centripetal pressure to define reality at a single center, whereas criticism is driven by the centrifugal pressure to define reality in the light of its outer circumference. If the whole truth is like a wheel, fundamentalism looks at its one hub and criticism at its several spokes.

In concentrating on the central implications of these terms and minimizing the aberrations which they may also describe, we are attempting to defuse an acrimonious debate with such little hope of constructiveness that it might well be called a "dialogue of the deaf." At the same time, we are trying to define the issue in such fashion that it does not identify two irreconcilable camps but rather two tendencies which coexist uneasily within every one of us. To be sure, by temperament and circumstance most persons are inclined to emphasize one side of the issue or the other, but at bottom the tension cannot be resolved by a fight to the finish between "us" and "them." Let me now see if I can substantiate that contention by a look at Scripture, tradition, theology, and practice.

I. Biblical

In the Scriptures, we frequently find a concern for religious absolutes. For example, Gerhard von Rad in his study of the kerygmatic creeds of the Old Testament, and C. H. Dodd in his study of the apostolic preaching of the New Testament, have shown that both Israel and the church typically reduced their proclamation to a brief, consistent pattern. Particularly in the later books of the New Testament, one frequently finds what are called "faithful sayings," terse formulae which compress a confession of faith into a few simple words. For example, I Timothy 3:16 (RSV) begins, "Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion . . . ." Despite the greatness of this mystery, however, it is then summarized in only eighteen words, a kind of fundamental credo consisting of six terse affirmations.

The same tendency toward absolutism is seen in ethics as well as in theology. The Ten Commandments are too well known to need mention, some of them being expressed in only one Hebrew word. When questioned on this subject, Jesus was willing to enunciate only two commandments on which depended "all the law and prophets" (Matthew 22:36-40). In the epistles, there are a number of ethical catechisms, such as the lists of virtues and vices, which draw moral reality in plain black-and-white terms. The book of James, in particular, compresses practical wisdom into a series of pithy observations.

At the same time, there is also elaboration and development toward complexity in the Bible. In the Old Testament, for example, the history of Israel had already been recorded in Samuel and Kings when it was deemed appropriate to tell much of the story over again in Chronicles, introducing a number of refinements and distinctions which had not been needed in the earlier version. While Jesus often cut through complexity to the heart of the matter, he also found it necessary to make careful distinctions in order to discriminate between Scripture and tradition (Mark 7:1-23), between piety and hypocrisy (Matthew 23), and between the varieties of apocalyptic speculation which were rife in his day (Mark 13). Before teaching his disciples the Lord's Prayer, Jesus was critical even of the way in which most people prayed (Matthew 6:5-8).

Paul also found it necessary to elaborate on the basic themes of his preaching when immature converts oversimplified their meaning. Almost the entire epistle of I Corinthians, for example, is an attack on excessive fundamentalism at Corinth. One thinks only of the problem of eating meat offered to idols to remember how many subtle qualifications the apostle was forced to make. Likewise, the long and involved arguments of Romans 9-11 bears eloquent witness to the impossibility of solving "the Jewish problem" with a few simple propositions. Even though we have no writings

from Paul's opponents, his own letters contain frequent hints that he was viewed as vascillating, ambiguous, even enigmatic because of his determination to "become all things to all men" (I Corinthians 9:19-23; II Corinthians 1:12-22).

II. Historical

Christian history has shown the same oscillation found in the Bible between the tendency toward absolutism and the tendency toward ambiguity. At times when the faith seemed overly complicated by cultural accretions, renewal came through the recovery of a few simple fundamentals. The Protestant Reformation, for example, was ignited around the single watchword, "Justification by faith." Baptists, likewise, first gained their distinctive identity by emphasizing only a few burning convictions which E. Y. Mullins later analyzed as the "axioms" of our religion.

Other moments in history, however, have been times of needed elaboration. The early creeds were not adequate for Augustine in an hour of massive upheaval, thus he stretched the Christian vision to encompass a whole theology of history in *The City of God.* When the Renaissance challenged the adequacy of medieval Catholic doctrine, Thomas Aquinas wrote a *Summa* that examined the entire body of divinity in the light of Aristotelian ways of thinking. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when the scientific method spread through all disciplines, historical criticism arose to ask intricate questions about the biblical test.

The greatest theologian in our century, Karl Barth, tried to revolt against the relativities of historicism in biblical study and to champion instead of absolute Christological principle, but in so doing he ended up writing the longest systematic theology on record, a ponderous "white elephant" with thousands of pages. Rudolf Bultmann has been called, with some justification, a "kerygmatic fundamentalist," yet no one has been more sensitive to the necessity for elaborating subtle distinctions in order to understand the Christian faith. In fact, for Bultmann no doctrine can ever be stated in timeless, stationary fashion, but must always be seen as an idea "on the move" as faith expresses itself in openness to the future.

What this swift sketch suggests is that tradition no more than Scripture decisively solves the question of complexity. Some read church history as the triumph of a few imperishable absolutes while other equally competent scholars read it as the endless proliferation of Christian ideas, the meaning of a variegated tapestry of truth which is still on the loom of time. This difference in perspective is caused not by the nature of the sources but by the eye of the beholder. Perhaps one factor is that for some the memory is selective while for others it is retentive.

III. Theological

Expressed in terms of Christian theology, the two outlooks with which we are dealing root in the difference between an eschatological and an historical vision of human existence. The eschatologist is always looking for that which is ultimate, final, eternal, and supreme. He seeks the constant in the midst of the contingent, the enduring in the midst of the transient, the divine in the midst of the human. The historicist, on the other hand, attempts to be realistic about the "given" of history, to trace causation in events, to see the human in the divine, to be honest about the complex fabric of historical existence.

Christianity cannot choose between these alternatives because it is both a profoundly eschatological and a profoundly historical religion. At the outset it affirms both that Jesus was the unlimited "Word" and that He was limited by "flesh." It affirms that the eternal became temporal, that the unconditioned became contingent, that the infinite became spatial. This means that in him the absolute and the ambiguous perfectly coexisted for a season. But the early Christians went on to understand the nature of their continuing existence as determined by the nature of His unique life. Rather than neatly compartmentalizing history and eternity, as did their Jewish predecessors, particularly the apocalypticists, they affirmed the paradox that eternity has broken into time and thus history and eschatology would be inextricably intertwined until the end of the world. "In Christ," they were living where the ages overlapped (I Corinthians 10:11). This means that in the Body of Christ, the church, both the absolute and the ambiguous converge because we are to be *in* the world but not *of* the world. To dissolve that tension is to opt either for escapism or for secularism.

Lying behind this paradoxical theological conviction is the more general philosophical issue of monism versus dualism. Ultimately the quest for absolutes roots in monism, expressed religiously as a monotheism which sees one God as the source of all reality. From this assumption comes an approach to truth as stated in timeless principles and to action as determined by irreducible norms. On this view, the more our statements about truth are fragmented, the more we seem to tear the seamless robe of reality.

At the same time, philosophy has never been entirely content with a simple monism, but has been forced to posit various types of metaphysical and moral dualisms. Behind reality as we know it there lies not only good but evil, not only God but Satan. It is significant that as the Bible progresses in its theological maturity, coming to a climax in Christ, the awareness of such dualism becomes more and more pronounced. The New Testament is quite clear that the conflict between light and darkness will not be transcended in this world but only in the consummation of all things.

The critical approach to truth rests squarely on this dualistic vision of reality. Because truth and error have not yet been separated, one must sharply discriminate the mixture of light and darkness which may fall on a certain subject. The temptations of Jesus show clearly that, because of the reality of Satan, even the Son of God had to struggle with several alternatives before determining the best course for his life to take. Despite our itch to eat the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, there is no "inviolable zone" (M. Kähler) where we may enjoy the security of a few simple ideas. Everything we touch is complicated by our brokenness and fallenness. True criticism does not root in a sense of prideful superiority by which we put our minds above more simple folk or even above the Bible, but in a realistic doctrine of sin which makes it difficult indeed to delineate what is uncontaminated in our own thoughts and deeds. The true biblical critic, for example, is not "criticizing the Bible" as is popularly misunderstood, but is rather criticizing the human factor

in biblical study, beginning with himself because he is painfully aware that ignorance and insensitivity may blind him to the true meaning of the text.

In short, we must balance two affirmations: (1) Truth is one because God is one; therefore, there is a bedrock on which we may finally stand. (2) Truth which is absolute in God may be ambiguous in man because of the distorting, corrupting power of evil; therefore, even the most cherished conviction must be subjected to rigorous scrutiny because of the possibility that it may be misguided.

IV. Practical

It should be obvious by now that the tension between absolutism and ambiguity which we find in every source of the Christian faith also roots in human nature as well. Sir Isaiah Berlin has analyzed these two mentalities by utilizing the distinction between the hedgehog and the fox in a line from the Greek poet Archilochus, "The fox knows many things but the hedgehog knows one great thing." That is, some men live by a few firm, simple norms while others rely on many cunning, versatile strategies (*e.g.:* Dante vs. Shakespeare, Washington vs. Jefferson, Coolidge vs. Roosevelt).

Applied to the religious sphere, there are obviously those who respond to Christ more like the hedgehog. Emil Brunner once quoted a Frenchman as saying, "The gospel that cannot be put on a postcard is not the gospel." For the gospel is good news, and good news should not take forever to tell. Moreover, there are many folk who do not have the mental patience or academic training to hold a number of complex theological distinctions in their minds. The plea to "make it plain" is not necessarily based on shallow superficiality. It is an open question in our day of declining scholastic aptitude whether the average person can grasp the complexities, for example, of biblical criticism. Again, there are many Christians who live faithfully by a few obvious moral imperatives, and our society is so much the better for that, even if they cannot think through the baffling ambiguities of a moral position on war, abortion, euthanasia, and other such imponderables. When Joseph Wood Krutch wrote his biography of Henry David Thoreau, he began with this significant sentence, "The lesson which Henry David Thoreau taught himself and which he hoped he might teach to others was summed up in one word: 'Simplify.'"

One of the loveliest flowerings of this imperative has come to us through the Quaker tradition. In his *Testament of Devotion,* Thomas Kelley concludes with a chapter on "The Simplification of Life" which is a kind of charter for uncluttered living. Shifting the blame away from the complexity of our modern environment, Kelley indicts us for a lack of inner integration. "We are trying to be several selves at once, without all our selves being organized by a single, mastering Life within us. Each of us tends to be, not a single self, but a whole committee of selves. . . . Life is meant to be lived from a Center, a divine Center. . . . Nothing else really counts so much as attentiveness to that Root of all living which is found within oneself" (pp. 103-114).

At the same time, there are those who respond to Christ more like the fox, determined not to make things simpler than they really are. The late Senator Thomas Hart Benton used to say that the worst disease afflicting his constituents back in Missouri was a malady which he called "the simples." Every preacher, like every politician, despairs of the demand that he reduce all of the problems of life to a few neat answers. Redemption may begin to take root when one hears a simple "plan of salvation," but we must remember that redemption involves much more than that. Even a well-trained counselor cannot always disentangle the promptings of God from the apron strings of motherhood, or the moral imperatives of the gospel from the mores of society, or the motivation for service from the need for ego gratification. Our racially divided South must hear a simple imperative, "Love one another," but one who stops there is inviting only frustration if he fails to relate love to such concrete problems as integration, busing, and open housing. Beside the imperative, "Make it plain!," we must also set the imperative, "Spell it out!"

My conclusion, therefore, is that Christ is Lord both of our absolutes and of our ambiguities and that we make a mistake to champion only one or the other. It is no secret, however, that mine is a minority position. All about us are those who, at one extreme, seek rational absolutism in some view of the Bible, such as infallibility; emotional absolutism in some type of religious ecstasy, such as glossolalia; or institutional absolutism in some form of ecclesiology, such as Landmarkism. Then there are those at the other extreme intent only on pointing out the ambiguities in the historical nature of the Bible, or in the interpretation of subjective religious experience, or in the claims of any particular denomination. In the face of this polarization I shall work to put Christ both at the center and at the circumference of reality and to commend his claims both to the wise and to the simple. I invite you to join me on that nearly vacant, always vulnerable, but invitingly spacious middle ground.

MANY WORLDS IN ONE

William E. Hull

As modern man is uprooted and driven into vast collective organizations, he seeks both to preserve his identity by magnifying particular distinctives and to affirm his solidarity by magnifying what he has in common with the total group. Paradoxically, the more we become "one world" the more each one of us treasures that which sets him apart. This creates an internal tension between the "one" and the "many" which expresses itself outwardly in a number of social conflicts involving such diverse issues as the segregation and the integration of the races, the differences and the similarities of the sexes, the independence and the interdependence of the nations, and the denominational and ecumenical natures of the church.

In analyzing the four illustrations just enumerated, it is interesting that most persons positionize themselves consistently on all four issues. One "syndrome" almost invariably favors white supremacy, male dominance, national sovereignty, and denominational exclusiveness, while the other "syndrome" favors a pluralistic culture,

woman's liberation, support of the United Nations, and fraternal relations with other church bodies. Nor is this clustering accidental. In all of these instances, one group is championing what is particularistic about mankind, the other group what is universalistic about mankind.

Here are battlefields where excruciating social pressures would force us to choose sides and fight to the finish. The conflict becomes especially fierce when one enters the fray on all four of the fronts just cited. Imagine the dagger points arrayed when those whose sympathies are aligned with the White Citizens' Council, the Bill Gothard Institute, the John Birch Society, and the Landmark movement meet those with loyalties to the NAACP, the NOW sisterhood, the World Federalists, and the World Council of Churches!

Even here, however, where middle ground is a "no-man's-land" of bristling conflict we must insist that reality is larger than either of the shrivelled options currently being offered. Let us attempt to clarify that claim by one last look at our basic sources of the Christian faith.

I. Biblical

The Bible is notoriously ambiguous on the issue of the one and the many because it is at once the most particularistic and the most universalistic body of literature ever written.

To begin with, there is everywhere a narrowing process by which the divine purpose came to focus on particular individuals and groups. From the outset, following an abortive effort to build the tower of Babel which shattered the solidarity of humanity and confounded its common tongue, God called out one man, Abraham, and made his physical descendants the channel of promise, thereby organizing the People of God on a racial basis. The prominence given to progeny, symbolized by the rite of circumcision, meant that Israelite culture was controlled by males through whom the lineage passed. Moreover, when this race acquired the Promised Land it further organized itself into a nation and quickly became embroiled in international political intrigue which eventually led to its conquest and collapse. Out of the debacle of exile came the final transmutation, a church with its own cult, Scriptures, and tradition. By the time of the New Testament, our particularistic syndrome had become whole-orbed: Judaism was now racially segregated, male dominated, politically partisan, and religiously exclusive.

Let us not blink in the face of this phenomenon which offends so many modern sensibilities. While time and space do not permit here, it is relatively easy to identify Biblical passages which develop racial segregation to the point of apartheid (*e.g.*, in post-exilic relations with the Samaritans). We dare not dodge abundant evidence of male chauvinism which held woman in subjection as chattel property (*e.g.*, as regards property rights and religious vows). It is well known that nationalistic passions often reached the point of outright rebellion (*e.g.*, in the Maccabean Revolt of 167 B.C. or the war against Rome in A.D. 70). So religiously restrictive had Judaism become that even the vast majority of its own people did not qualify for inclusion (*e.g.*, in Pharisaism)! Although it is popular to dismiss these unpleasant features as cultural accretions of a more primitive era, the Bible itself will not permit such radical surgery. Instead of apologizing, it goes out of the way to exalt racial seed, and male circumcision, and Davidic kingdom, and holy remnant as normative theological categories for expressing the divine intention. In other words, far from being a scandal or even an embarassment, precisely these particularistic structures are understood as vehicles for fulfilling the will of God.

It is only against this backdrop by which the Bible affirms the place of race and sex and nation and church in the plan of God that we are prepared to grasp the radical universality of the biblical faith. Even within the Old Testament were planted the seeds of an eschatological hope that transcends these categories even as it acknowledges their validity. The prophets plowed the ground by lashing out against feelings of racial or national superiority; against the exploitation of the suppressed, such as widows; and against a religious smugness which held its Temple to be inviolate. Then the apocalyptists began to dream of a worldwide gathering of all peoples, of wars that would destroy evil rather than nations, of a Temple where every person would worship God. How quickly in the New Testament these latent buds of expectation began to burst into full bloom! By a breathtaking process of spiritualization, all of the limiting institutions of Judaism were interiorized and so universalized: circumcision, the Sabbath, the Temple. Before one generation was past Paul could cry that something had happened "in Christ" which had not happened anywhere else in the world: "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Galatians 3:28, RSV).

Jesus was obviously the unique catalyst of this entire transformation. As such, he was the one person in whom particularism and universalism perfectly coalesced. On the one hand, he was explicitly Jewish, as the genealogies attest. He was male to the point of never marrying and of calling only men as members of the Twelve. He was provincial to the point of never straying beyond the boundaries of tiny Palestine. He was at home within the religious institutions of his ancestral faith and, so far as we know, never showed a flicker of interest in the many cults that infested the Graeco-Roman world. But, on the other hand, he completely ignored circumcision as the badge of belonging championed by his contemporaries; instead, he set in its place an inward faith by which even women could equally respond to God. His kingdom was cosmic in its inclusiveness (Matthew 8:11) needing no Davidic leader to compel those to enter who had been excluded by Jewish separatism. Finally, he died alone as a solitary figure of "one" in order that the "many" might be saved (Mark 10:45).

II. Historical

With this dual heritage both from its Savior and from its Scriptures, it is not surprising that the history of the church has manifested an ambivalence in our area of concern. On the one hand, it reached out in its missionary passion to embrace every race on earth but then, on the other hand, made racial differences a major factor in organizing its institutional life. It has continued to magnify sexual distinctions, especially in the hierarchical priesthood, but has given its female adher-

ents many freedoms and privileges which they did not enjoy in Judaism. In some settings it has championed a decentralized localism which rigidly separates church and state, while in other settings it has become a national church openly supported by the political establishment. Some of its wings have been narrowly partisan to the point of sectarianism while others have been broadly tolerant to the point of syncretism.

In many ways, these divergent tendencies have come to group themselves around Protestantism and Catholicism, the two great expressions of the Christian faith developed through its long history. In essence, Protestantism is an expression of Christian particularity. Its concern is with the personal experience of the individual, with the authenticity of the present moment of history, with the almost deliberate fragmentation of the church (250-350 denominations in the USA alone!) in order to adapt to differing environments. By contrast, Catholicism opts for the cohesive, the unitary, the comprehensive expression of the faith. Its sacramentalism forges a bond with the whole of nature. Its normative doctrine of tradition stresses the continuities of history. Its ecclesiology sets mankind within the solidarity of the universal church. The basic momentum of Catholicism is centripetal, which is why it can sustain a world spatial center in Rome, whereas the basic momentum of Protestantism is centrifugal, which is why it can never be sure that even one local congregation will hold together!

For many, of course, this riddle of history is solved simply by choosing one of these traditions to the exclusion of the other. And, indeed, as long as we are in the dialectical situation of two fundamentally different options, just such a choice may be imperative in order to maintain the needed overall balance. Who is to say if we will ever be able to maintain both of these tendencies under one institutional roof? As long as that proves impossible, however, let us not pretend that either side has a corner on reality. It is probably unconscious endorsement of the position which I am here espousing that some of the most sensitive spirits in Protestantism yearn to be more "Catholic" while some of the most sensitive spirits in Catholicism yearn to be more "Protestant."

III. Theological

In order to approach our problem theologically, we must remember that a constitutive feature of biblical faith is the integral connection which it maintains between creation and redemption. Against every form of gnosticism which would attribute creation to the work of an inferior or alien deity, as well as against every form of secularism which would interpret redemption as wishful thinking, Christianity asserts that one and the same God both created this world and is re-creating it in accordance with his unchanging purposes. This is why there is an ultimate congruity between protology and eschatology, Alpha and Omega, beginning and end. This is also why the Christian is to live *in* the world and yet not be *of* the world. The former is possible because even fallen creation, marred by man's sin, is a gift of God. The latter is necessary because God does not intend to leave creation corrupted but in Christ has called it afresh to its original intention.

This dialectical relation between creation and redemption means that we cannot choose between particularism and universalism. For it is by God's creation that our human differences are fully honored. We were not blindly fated but were purposefully *made* black or white, male or female, of many nations and religious persuasions. By redemption, however, we know that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free because He will be all and in all and will reconcile all things unto Himself. Because every man is created in the image of God, that same God is seeking to *re*create him after the image of His son. The doctrine of creation allows us to celebrate the different ways in which we were made, yet the doctrine of redemption never allows us to absolutize these differences or to make them a basis for divisiveness. I must take very seriously the fact that I find myself to be white, male, American, and Baptist, but in so doing I must remember that in the New Age these racial, sexual, national, and denominational differences all disappear.

Lurking behind these theological formulations is a philosophical issue which has long been pondered in terms of the medieval distinction between realism and nominalism. The former position contends that universals are superior to particulars since they exist before them (*ante res*) whereas the latter holds that reality exists only in particulars hence universals exist only derivatively after them (*post res*). The Bible resolves this issue by affirming both that "in the beginning God created" (Genesis 1:1) and that "in the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1). That is, both the particularity of matter and the universality of meaning root in God, hence neither is in conflict with the other. It is finally fruitless to speculate, for example, whether God conceived of me first as a particular white male, or as part of a raceless sexless universal humanity, since both destinies were envisaged by Him from the beginning.

IV. Practical

Creative literature is often a better guide than either history or thought to the reconciliation of these estranged polarities in our own experience. The novelist, for example, seeks to portray the enduring issues of human existence but to do so through a very particular set of characters and circumstances. No one has surpassed William Faulkner in grasping the complex texture of Southern life; yet he succeeded brilliantly not in spite of but precisely by localizing this vast panorama in a single family living in one isolated county with an unpronounceable name! Again, has any contemporary writer spoken more eloquently of the evil that torments our times than Aleksandr Solzhenitzyn? Yet he has done so by concentrating on a particular string of prison camps that we shall never even see. These illustrations say only that there is a strange sense in which the universal always lies latent within the particular and, conversely, in which the universal may be grasped only through the particular.

Let me attempt one final clarification as I conclude this analysis of our fragmented culture. In a series of case studies I have sought to show that some of the most hotly debated polarities in contemporary life may, on closer inspection, represent not either/or alternatives but both/and paradoxes. This does not imply, however, that every adversary relationship may finally be reconciled. Good and evil, for example, re-

main ultimate antagonists in whatever guises they assume. Love and hate may share the same boundary but there is no way to negotiate a détente between their ruling passions. Yet, when full allowance has been made for the dialectical necessities of existence, there are many other areas in which we have foolishly rent the seamless robe of truth in a futile effort to claim only a part instead of the whole. It was John Stuart Mill, I think, who said that we are more often right in what we affirm than in what we deny.

In this plea to see the larger unity beyond so many of our competing divisions, I am not suggesting that every person search for a balanced "mean" in the Platonic-Aristotelian sense and try always to stand midway between the polarities of any legitimate paradox. Some may find their situations already tilted toward one focus of the ellipse and so deliberately emphasize the other focus in order to restore a better equilibrium. Clearly that is a crying moral imperative in some quarters today. But I would observe that each of our polarities seem already to have more than their share of partisans whereas not many are opting for middle ground. My real contention is that just as a strong financial "middle class" is essential to a healthy economy, so a strong ideological "middle class" is essential to a healthy society.

There will always be circumscribed spirits available and eager to occupy the safe terrain at either extreme. But is it not perhaps the special calling of those who read more widely and think more deeply to populate the broad expanse of no-man's-land which lies in between? Just as the body is debilitated by a hardening of the arteries, so the spirit shrivels when there is a hardening of the categories. I cannot believe that such brittle, predictable strategies honor Him through whom God is reconciling *all things* unto Himself. Perhaps we are just beginning to realize how far that reconciliation is meant to reach.

THE BROKEN WALL

William E. Hull

One of the most potent symbols of man's perpetual frustration in the modern world is a twenty-five-mile-wide dagger driven deep into the heart of a brave but beleaguered city. Thrown up between midnight on August 12 and morning on August 13, 1961, the Berlin Wall is an outrage and effrontery to all who behold it. Marching insolently across proud plazas, invading ancient cemeteries, sending roots of steel down into sewers, the Wall overnight created a concentration camp which condemned more than a million East Berliners to a collective claustrophobia. Like a jagged wound from a blunt weapon, the Wall literally amputated a great city in its mid-section, severing those vital arteries through which the oppressed could flow in their search for freedom. As a Berlin policeman put it, "The Wall is just sad. It is not just ridiculous. It is schizophrenic."

And yet this "Wall of Shame" is but the most visible symbol of a vastly larger reality. Not only is it part of the hundred-mile ring around West Berlin, sealing off that island of courage in a subcontinent of tyranny, but it also belongs to the 830-mile "Iron Curtain" which guards East Germany's western frontier from the Baltic to Czechoslovakia. On the other side of the world a "Bamboo Curtain" now shrouds China in mystery as that enormous nation convulses with changes that may have fearful consequences for all mankind. Near to home, a "Velvet Curtain" of affluence drops protectively between the flourishing suburbs and those pockets of poverty which fester in the ghettos. The "Sheepskin Curtain" separates a diploma elite from many not fortunate enough to gain a college education. Racial minorities still feel hemmed in by the "Jim Crow Curtain" of second-class citizenship.

Ours is a wall-weary world searching for those liberating forces which can breach the battlements that confine and constrict the human spirit. In this quest for a wall-breaker, Christianity is in danger of coming out second best. All too often, we picture our Christ in passive categories: at Christmas he is a babe "asleep in the manger"; at the Cross he is a sacrificial victim offered "as a lamb for the slaughter"; while at Easter he is an exalted Lord "seated at the right hand of the Father" in glory. Modern man will not readily see how a sleeping babe, a suffering lamb, or a sitting Lord can do much about those walls which stifle the human spirit.

In Ephesians 2:14, the apostle Paul provides a remarkably relevant category by which to consider the work of Christ. The central thrust of the entire ministry of Jesus is summarized in the explosive phrase, ". . . he has broken down the dividing wall of hostility." Here is a new Joshua who has breached, not the wall of Jericho, but those of the Jewish Temple, as the larger context makes clear (Ephesians 2:11-22). Paul does not express the wish that Christ *could*, or the hope that he *will*, but rather the confidence that he already *has* demolished those barriers which lay at the heart of his ancestral religion.

Is that same Christ able to destroy the "walls of hostility" which make men enemies in our day? To answer that question we must first rediscover just how he dismantled the walls of his own day. This will require a tour of the Temple precincts where those walls stood which symbolized in microcosm the walled-in world of Judaism in the first century. Essentially, the Jerusalem Temple was a Christian church turned inside out. Whereas we worship entirely within the building, using the outside only for landscaping and parking, the one place where the Jew never went was inside his Temple, worshiping rather on the outside in a series of courtyards carefully circumscribed by a cluster of concentric walls.

I.

Upon reaching the outer gates of the Temple precincts, a pilgrim would first enter the Court of the Gentiles, a large area reserved for non-Jews who worshiped Israel's God. Defining the boundaries of this enclosure was a five foot high balustrade on which were posted signs that archaeologists have been fortunate enough to recover. One of these inscriptions reads: "No foreigner [literally: 'one of another race'] may enter within the fence and enclosure around the Sanctuary. Whoever is caught will have himself to blame for the death which will inevitably follow." The Gentile who ventured be-

yond this racial wall literally took his life in his own hands.

Lest we suppose this to be an exaggerated threat, remember an episode in the life of Paul recorded in Acts 21:27-32. There, on the merest suspicion that he might have encouraged a foreigner (Trophimus the Ephesian) to enter the Temple, the Apostle was dragged outside its inner area and would have been beaten to death had he not been rescued at the last moment by Roman soldiers. Even though Paul was himself a Jew, he could instantly inflame his countrymen to commit murder in the very shadows of the sanctuary by showing the slightest disrespect for the racial wall that kept non-Jews in the remotest "vestibule" of the Temple. Paul could point to scars on his own body for proof that this was indeed a "dividing wall of *hostility*."

Despite the fact that he was almost destroyed by the animosity which accumulated at that wall century after century, Paul was convinced that Christ had already demolished its effectiveness. What was the basis of this confidence? Jesus came to a religion with a strong racial consciousness. The destiny of Israel was believed to be inseparable from the Jewish race. In such a setting, Jesus made no mention of circumcision, the rite which marked one as belonging to the people of God simply by virtue of birth in a Jewish family. Instead, he championed "faith," a personal response to God which even a Roman centurion might make more adequately than any Jew (Matthew 8:10). With a disdain for the strictures of Jewish racial prejudice, Jesus penetrated to the sinner, the Syrophoenician, the Samaritan, the Roman soldier. When at last he made his supreme claim upon the Temple, no wonder he banished its holy hucksters from the Court of the *Gentiles* for their failure to make it "a house of prayer for *all the nations*" (Mark 11:17, RSV).

But this attack on the racial wall cost Jesus his life. Finally, the only charge which his enemies could make stick was the distorted accusation—which did contain a grain of truth—that he was trying to destroy their Temple (Mark 14:58; 15:29). Did Christ destroy the Wall, or did it destroy him? The faith that transcended race did not perish forever on the cross, but was soon risen to become the faith of his followers. The book of Acts tells how, slowly but surely, the disciples began to discover that the gospel could not be contained behind any of the racial walls erected to protect Judaism. Less than a generation after Jesus' death, Paul could look back on an accomplished fact and cry, "Neither Jew nor Greek . . . for you are all *one* in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28, RSV). It is an indisputable fact of early Christian history that a movement which began within the most profoundly racial religion in history quickly grew to become a universal religion which embraced every race, nation, and culture without distinction.

To be sure, Judaism had made progress in that direction. In response to a growing Old Testament conviction, a place had been provided for other races within the total Temple structure. The Jews would never say that a foreigner did not deserve to know God; they only insisted that he worship him from a distance, "in his place" on the outer periphery of the Temple precincts. The Christian difference was one of degree, of taking this beginning to its ultimate fulfillment by abolishing *all* racial distinctions, not so much in earthly society where they might be very real, but "in Christ," in the life of His Body, the Church.

Like the Jews, we too have made solid progress in this direction. In fact, most Christian churches in America are filled almost entirely with non-Jews. How did we, as Anglo-Saxon Gentiles, get into the very heart of the sanctuary except that Christ long ago demolished the distinctions that would have condemned us to an inferior position? It is really ludicrous to realize that many white Southern Christians, who do not themselves qualify racially for the religion of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, have insisted that another non-Jewish race (Negro) could not join them beyond the racial barrier but would have to worship "in their place"!

The church which Christ died to free from all walls can never identify itself with any racial, national, or cultural group. It can never post a sign in its vestibule outlawing the "foreigner." It is common, for example, to refer to the Church *of* England or the Church *of* Scotland. This is a subtle but serious mistake. The New Testament speaks of the church *in* Corinth or the church *in* Rome. The church is to be *in*, but not *of*, the country where it lives. By its very nature, the Church can never become a Caucasian church, or an American church, or a Southern church. To make such racial, national, or cultural distinctions is to build back walls which Christ died to tear down.

II.

Advancing, then, beyond the racial wall, the Temple pilgrim would move from the Court of the Gentiles to the Court of Women. Here was a "halfway house" reserved for the orthodox Jewish female whose privileges were greater than those of the foreigner but less than those of the Jewish male. She could draw nearer to the sanctuary than a non-Jew but was prevented from going farther by a second wall which separated her from the Court of Israel. Thus the Jewish understanding of humanity's standing before God included not only a racial wall between Jew and Gentile but a sexual wall between male and female.

Essentially this wall symbolized the place of woman in Judaism as a second-class religious citizen. At birth she did not undergo circumcision, the supreme rite of initiation into the Jewish commonwealth. She could not grow up to become a priest, a Levite, or a rabbi. She both worshiped separately in the Temple and occupied a segregated section of the synagogue. If single, she was expected to follow the religion of her father; if married, the religion of her husband. The contemporary Jewish historian, Josephus, remarked that "in every respect woman is inferior to man," a Jewish viewpoint to which Paul alluded in I Corinthians 11. In fact, the rabbis were accustomed to pray a daily prayer which included the statement, "I thank God that I was not born a woman."

But Paul, born and bred on these Jewish prejudices, somehow came to believe that the sexual wall had no place in the true Temple of God. Once again, Christ provided the basis for that dramatic change. By making faith rather than circumcision central to his message, he not only enabled a foreigner to stand on equal footing with a Jew but also a woman to experience religious equality with a man. To a desperate daughter of Israel who tugged at the tassel on his prayer shawl, Jesus replied, "Your *faith* has made you well" (Mark 5:34,

RSV). Moreover, he demanded that women make their own religious commitment to him even if it shattered the solidarity of the family (Matthew 10:35; Luke 12:53). In response, women redeemed from many diseases formed a special band that accompanied him from Galilee, several of whom were so prominent that their names have become a part of the gospel record (Luke 8:2-3). It is disconcerting for men to remember that these women were the last at the cross in courage, the first at the tomb in love.

The new status conferred by Christ quickly became characteristic of the early Church. Women shared together with men in preparation for Pentecost (Acts 1: 14). Their homes became the earliest house-churches of Jerusalem (Acts 12:12). In some cases, they became the founders of a new congregation, as at Philippi (Acts 16:13). Women assumed their rightful prominence in church leadership (Priscilla—Romans 16:3), sharing responsibility for the office of deacon ("Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae"—Romans 16: 1) and rendering distinctive ministries to such groups as widows (I Timothy 5:3-16).

It is sometimes supposed that Paul was not sympathetic to sexual equality within the church because he enjoined women to silence in I Corinthians 14:34-35 (cf. I Timothy 2:11-12). A careful consideration of the context, however, shows that precisely the opposite inference should be drawn (I Corinthians 14:20-33). In the unstable and immature church at Corinth, Paul was addressing women who had become intoxicated with their new sense of freedom and were inexperienced in the use of their new-found opportunities for religious fulfillment. Because the church was so far ahead of the world in its attitude toward women, Paul cautioned them to be circumspect lest the outsider misunderstand their boldness (vv. 23-25). However, in the same I Corinthians he made it quite clear that the role of women included praying and prophesying (I Corinthians 11:5). For Paul the ultimate theological principle was never in doubt. Not only in Christ is there "neither Jew nor Greek," but also there is "neither male nor female" (Galatians 3:28).

Once again, let us give credit to Judaism where credit is due. This religion had gone a long way toward elevating the dignity of woman, strengthening the sanctity of her sex and the stability of her home life. As with race, the Christian difference was one of degree. Because God, not man, determines both the race and the sex to which one is born, it is not for man arbitrarily to assign priorities and prejudices to factors over which he has no control. Not only by creation but, as our text indicates, by the cross ("blood") of Christ are such distinctions abolished. Standing at Calvary, neither race nor sex matters any more in the approach to God.

Like the Jews of Jesus' day, we have made progress in the religious emancipation of women. A typical Christian church today finds both sexes seated together, usually in family units, for worship. A few women have been called to church staff positions, while more have served magnificently as foreign missionaries. Many women are no longer bound to the faith of their families, but feel free to make independent religious decisions as God guides them. Clearly we have *lowered* the wall of sexual distinction, but have we *leveled* it to the ground?

The Church, like Judaism, is still a man's world in many crucial areas. Though women may exercise a full gospel ministry, ordination is arbitrarily limited to males. In most Southern Baptist churches (though not in other Baptist bodies), deacons are almost invariably men. In many churches women give half or more of the money, yet finance and budget committees are almost exclusively a male domain. The power structure of the Southern Baptist Convention is drastically one-sided; even agencies that have a very large responsibility to women have almost no female trustees on their boards. Although women have largely won political equality on the American scene, they still do not have proportionate representation in the decision-making processes of the church. How tragically the church deprives itself of the spiritual resources available among women! For example, even though half of the people we are trying to win are female, our evangelistic programs and personnel are totally male dominated.

Ours is a day when women have been exploited more subtly yet more cruelly than any generation in history. On every hand, the crass sensuality of our culture conspires to cheapen them as little more than playthings or servants whose mission in life is to bolster the male ego. Although sexual tensions usually simmer beneath the surface, here is another wall where profound hostilities have gathered. Women need to discover in the church a climate of opinion and a quality of relationship which celebrates the glorious fact that God both made them and redeemed them as women.

The Gospel of Thomas discovered recently in Egypt closes with the request of Simon Peter, "Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of life." To this shocking suggestion the Gnostic tract makes Jesus reply, "I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven" (saying 114). It is high time that we condemn this heresy in the contemporary church!

III.

If the Temple pilgrim were to move beyond the racial and sexual walls which restricted the Court of Gentiles and the Court of Women, he would finally enter the Court of Israel where orthodox, circumcised, law-abiding Jewish men were privileged to worship. Surely here, it might seem, would be an area without a wall, but alas, one final barrier remained. Another low balustrade separated the Court of Israel from the Court of Priests where only the sons of Aaron who offered sacrifice were permitted to venture. Here stood a third imposing barrier, the vocational wall between priest and layman.

Although Judaism sponsored robust lay movements, such as the Pharisees, it was essentially a sacerdotal religion with a pyramid of power moving from the village priests up through the chief priestly families to the one supreme high priest. The layman brought his sacrifice to the Temple, but handed it over the wall to priests who then offered it on the altar. In this symbolic sense, Judaism fostered a proxy faith which interposed between man and God a human mediator arbitrarily qualified by his ancestry. Of course, the layman was encouraged to be guided toward God

by the symbolism which the priest enacted before his eyes, but this possibility was diminished by the chasm which lay between him and a hierarchy whose standards he could not meet.

For Paul, a Temple without walls meant that Christ had also broken the vocational barrier. A final look at the ministry of Jesus suggests how this happened. His forerunner, John the Baptist, was the son of a priest who repudiated his hereditary privileges to minister alone as a layman in the wilderness. When startled priests inquired regarding his authority to baptize, John appealed to God alone to vindicate his strange career. Jesus deliberately linked his ministry to that of the layman-prophet John. Again and again he provoked the religious Establishment to ask, "By what authority. . .?" The controversy behind that question centered on the fact that he was not ordained; he had not attended the rabbinic academies; he was not a priest or the son of a priest; he did not have any ministerial credentials. The simple truth is that Jesus was a layman, as were those whom he recruited to be the foundation of his movement.

Christianity was launched as a lay movement and so it continued throughout the New Testament period. Not only was everyone a layman, but everyone was also a priest, for the work of the priesthood belonged to the vocation of faith. No longer did the worshiper watch as a priest offered his animal sacrifice. Instead, as Paul put it, every Christian was a priest offering *himself* as a "living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship" (Romans 12:1, RSV).

Nothing illustrates this transformation better than the claims which are central to the book of Hebrews. In Judaism, only a handful of priests on duty entered the holy place of the sanctuary, while only the high priest entered the innermost holy of holies once a year on the Day of Atonement. By contrast, Hebrews 6:19 proclaims that every Christian "enters into the inner shrine behind the veil." This venture is described in Hebrews 10: "Therefore, brethren, since we have *confidence* to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and *living* way which he has opened for us through the curtain . . . let us draw near with a true heart in full *assurance* of faith . . ." (vv. 19-22, RSV). Here every Christian believer, however humble, boldly grasps the reality of God with a directness denied even the high priest in Judaism.

To be sure, Judaism had made some progress through its priesthood in penetrating the veil which guards the ultimate Mystery, but they had not been able to do so with the intensity claimed by the first Christians. Today, many who call themselves Christian are content to live in an outer court far removed from the "secret place of the Most High," depending on the work of a priest to mediate the presence of God. Even in Baptist life a growing professionalism of the clergy has opened a cleavage which is foreign to our faith in the "priesthood of every believer."

As is true once a wall is built, hostilities begin to gather. Clergymen become more and more jealous for the privileges of their office. Ordination assumes increasing importance and ministry is redefined by a managerial model in terms of the authority which one is able to exercise. Conversely, laymen feel pressured to carve out a separate sphere of influence for themselves, devising structures which will "keep the preacher in his place" by assigning him spiritual affairs while laymen supervise the temporal affairs of the church. Such cleavages do not reflect the New Testament understanding of ministry; hence they inevitably give rise to internal tensions.

It is time to recover in principle and in practice the Baptist conviction that every Christian is a minister, and that every ministry is both spiritual and temporal, both vertical and horizontal, both a service to God on behalf of man and a service to man on behalf of God. Clearly there are legitimate distinctions in function, based on a variety of spiritual gifts, but there must not develop differences of status based on the inherent privileges of office. Minister and layman together must lead in worship, must win the lost, must distribute funds for the necessity of the saints, must undergird the mission of the church in prayer, must become competent interpreters of the written Word.

Conclusion

We have defined the work of Christ as that of the Great Abolitionist, the New Joshua who batters down racial, sexual, and vocational walls. Some suppose that such issues are not crucial, that we should speak only of his "rending of the veil" between man and God. But the symbolism of our primary passage provides a needed corrective to this perspective. In the Temple which Paul knew, no one could enter the sanctuary until he could first get beyond the outer walls. Here is the supreme significance of our text: only as Christ breaks down the three outer walls are we able to enter *all together* into the presence of God. To keep the foreigner, the woman, or the layman back "in their place" is to keep them *too far from God!* The finished work of Christ permits an immediacy of divine encounter which cries with the hymn writer, "*Nothing* between my soul and the Saviour."

Ours is a wall-weary world where ugly fissures rend the human fabric of life. To the cynic it seems that such walls of hostility will stand forever. But walls can become obsolete even before they fall. It is quite possible that Paul wrote Ephesians around A.D. 62, just at the time when the Jews were finishing their Temple building program of the past eighty years. If so, this means that at the very moment when his countrymen were proudly laying the last stone in place in their magnificent Temple, Paul dared to write that these apparently monolithic walls had already begun to buckle, fatally undermined by the Christ who had challenged them a generation earlier.

Do we have the faith of Paul to believe that some of the most formidable barricades in life may be broken down? Even our best built walls can quickly become obsolete. In the summer of 1967, the French offered their famed Maginot Line for sale. The pillboxes which once stood as the most impregnable defense against foreigners ever built were now purchased by Germans as summer homes which offered a picturesque view of the Rhine! Can we let Christ transform our walls of hostility into homes where former enemies are now welcome, reconciled by the blood of His cross?

Carl Sandburg framed the prayer which is an appropriate response to the truth of our text:

Lay me on an anvil, O God.
Beat me and hammer me into a crowbar.
Let me pry loose old walls.

(*Prayers of Steel*)

A CHALLENGE TO RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP

Hubert H. Humphrey

I welcome this opportunity today to address this seminar of the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention. You have given me a big topic: "A Challenge to Responsible Citizenship." That is a very appropriate topic for our nation's Bicentennial. I imagine you are almost getting tired of the idea that everything has to be related to the Bicentennial, but it is a good jumping-off place—a place for us to really evaluate where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

The religious communities of this nation have a special responsibility for leading us in a proper Bicentennial observance. It is from the religious communities that we got those great affirmations about God, human nature, and human society, on which this nation's political covenant was truly founded. It is from the religious communities that we have received those great impulses based upon faith, love, and hope which have led to renewal in our political life. It is from the religious communities, as I see it, that we shall receive those resources which will help us address the problems we face in our own time.

Therefore, the religious communities, this community as well as others, have a special responsibility to lead us first in thanksgiving for the blessings that Almighty God has bestowed upon this land—and we have been richly blessed—and to help us take stock of our real strengths and indeed to even confess our failings as a people. To me, the Bicentennial offers us this opportunity.

The challenge to our churches and to our synagogues is to call our people to a renewed dedication to the many unfinished tasks which you and I know lie ahead of us—to demand that we press on toward the goal of assuring "liberty and justice for all," precisely because we are, as our Pledge of Allegiance puts it, "one nation, under God." I should mention that the Pledge of Allegiance which we repeat so often does not recognize fulfillment; it recognizes promise. We are a long way away from its total fulfillment, but it is a goal, it is a hope, it is a standard by which we shall judge our performance.

Now some people are worried that this Bicentennial will just be a merchandising episode; that it will be "rockets' red glare," signifying little or nothing. Some people, to whom America has been slow about keeping its promises, will only note that the Bicentennial is taking place, as they continue to struggle for existence in the midst of what most of us enjoy as a pretty good standard of living.

Peoples throughout the world will be watching us during this Bicentennial period to see if we shall take to heart Arnold J. Toynbee's advice to "rejoin our American Revolution." I believe that we can, if we understand what that Revolution was all about, and I believe we shall. I believe, furthermore, that religious communities such as the Southern Baptist Convention can and should take the leadership in making this Bicentennial era a creative and constructive period in our nation's history.

Let us call to heart and mind some of those great religious convictions upon which our institutions are based; those great debates about the public good which have taken place in our past, and those achievements and failures that the hand of history has placed on our shoulders to guide us through the present and toward the future.

John Adams, our first Vice President, once said that the American Revolution took place in the hearts and minds of Americans long before the first shot was fired in the eighteenth century conflict. He was right.

The apostle Paul had told the Christians in Galatia, "You have been called to freedom." So now, seventeen centuries later, men and women accustomed to freedom in their personal approach to God insisted upon freedom in their public expression of their ideas and in the ordering of their lives. In those early days of our Republic, religious thoughts and conviction were a powerful force and had a tremendous role. The Declaration of Independence, in fact, put in words a tremendous political revolution, springing from a spiritual emancipation. Men's minds and souls were to be free, free to build a new world. They were to be regarded as equal in the eyes of their Maker. The political literature of our early republic is permeated with a firm conviction of human dignity, dignity not achieved by man himself, but dignity because every human soul is part of the spirit of God.

I have been a teacher of American Government in colleges and universities, and I have had to tell my students that you cannot properly relate American history without considering its spiritual base. Nor can you really define or in a real sense justify democracy without understanding its spiritual content: the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, which is, of course, the spiritual base upon which human equality is based. It is only because each person is equal in the eyes of his Maker that we can really justify morally or politically government by the consent of the governed, that each vote, each person is important. No one has the right to rule another without his or her consent. This is all spiritual. If you look at it only politically, it will fall apart. The binding that holds it together is the spiritual content.

Drawing insights from their Hebrew, Christian, and classical heritages, and assessing their own colonial experiences, our forefathers began to develop their own ideas of what it takes to make a free government.

Some of them came to the conclusion that because of the deep corruption of the Old World and because of the conspiracy they felt existed against American liberties, they were justified in severing their ties with England. On the basis of their religious convictions, they wrote those great and abiding testaments of our revolutionary period—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

Just think of that kind of literature coming out of this country in a period of twenty years! Incredible! The most powerful political literature ever penned by the

hand of man—and those documents had an effect throughout the entire world. Whole empires were shaken, not by the force of our military, not by some magic secret weapon, but by the projection of a powerful idea based upon human dignity, and human dignity only being justified and verified by a spiritual belief or faith. Now I think it is time in this year of 1976 that we reaffirm those convictions that we have recited in these great documents of history.

Our forefathers believed, in the first place, that God is sovereign. All of the literature of this country emphasizes that: "King of kings, and Lord of lords," God was the source of all power. By God's own rule of law, by God's own demands of justice and mercy, God sets the purpose of government to be to serve the public good and to be limited in its powers precisely to carry out this fundamental purpose of serving the public good.

The Mayflower Compact, the first written constitution to govern Americans, *began* with these words, "In the name of God, Amen." It asserted that the whole purpose of those determined Pilgrims, in their struggle to found a new kingdom of free men and women, was "for the glory of God."

I wonder sometimes if we haven't lost sight of the tremendous religious input in the earliest days of this great, vast country of ours. To understand the tremendous impact of the world of the eighteenth century of those great words in the founding documents of the United States, just imagine you were hearing them for the first time; that you have never read them, never seen their facsimiles, but all at once somebody got up here and said, "Here is what I believe." Now put yourself back to 1776—with Louis XVI in France, George III in England, and the Czar in Russia—the whole world being governed by despots or emperors or kings. And then all at once you hear these words as if they could have been projected on a television screen, or on a radio or at a town meeting, and someone said, "Here is what we Americans believe:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . .

Ladies and gentlemen, that was revolutionary language at that time. Imagine announcing that to the world that was governed by the precepts of the divine right of kings, with all power unto the ruler and the state. Then listen to these words that I recite many times as I travel around this country, because it is the whole basis of our government.

> We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

What powerful words! If you will note, there is the philosophical base for our government: "We the People." Keep that in mind, that "We the People" followed the Declaration of Independence which recognized the people's relationship to Divine Providence and people's rights that were God-given rights—not given by some political party but God-given rights.

The preamble to the Constitution, states an *action* philosophy. Government was there to *do* something: to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to assure domestic tranquility, to provide—even at the point of sacrifice—for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty. This tells you that government is not neutral. It is supposed to be a people's government directed toward their justice, their safety, their tranquility, their defense, for their welfare, and for the blessings of liberty.

What a tremendous charge this was to the people of this land and what an unbelievable thrust it was in the politics of the eighteenth century. For these words hit the established world order like a thunderclap! No one from there on out, who was occupying any position of power without the consent of the governed, was safe. The exclusive divine right of kings, by which God's purposes were to be acted out, was rejected outright!

No more would there be an automatic caste system among the people, where a child born to a peasant family was to be a peasant for the rest of his or her days. No longer would there be a separate existence given to the State as such. Instead, people would be the final judges of government.

Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the great Christian theologians and one of our major political philosophers of American democracy, borrowed a passage from the apostle Paul to speak of all of us as being both the "children of light" and the "children of darkness." Applying this fundamental truth to the possibilities and limitations of government, Niebuhr said: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." Those are words to ponder.

Our forefathers, therefore, tried to devise a system of government which would provide for participation and consent of the people, and at the same time prevent the abuse of power or the corruption of power to serve special interests. They diffused or separated power so that interest might check interest. They separated the various functions of government (we call it the separation of powers) to keep government from becoming arbitrary. But they also tried to relate all these parts effectively so government might not be inert, but would actively help provide for the general welfare.

Our forefathers also believed that God fulfills his purposes in many different ways, and that it is presumptuous of any person or group of people to claim to know God's ways with complete certainty. Indeed, they believed the best way to ascertain God's will is through civil and religious liberty and through the openness which this liberty would provide citizens to debate and discuss public policy.

Some of our forefathers believed that the worst engine of tyranny was a combination of political power sanctioned by ecclesiastical establishment, the combination of church and state. Early in our colonial history Roger Williams, William Penn, and Cecil Calvert argued for a greater degree of toleration. Gradually, thanks particularly to the persistent efforts of Baptists, our founders enlarged guarantees of religious liberty, which

again is a hallmark of American democracy. They drew a new line of separation, to use James Madison's image, between civil and religious institutions in order to diffuse civil and religious power, and yet to provide for a proper interaction between them.

We know, and some of our more contemporary novelists have reminded us, that our first citizens had warts and that our American Revolution had its seamy side. For example, our founders fought a revolution in the name of liberty, but denied freedom to the slaves. They sought to diffuse power and check it, yet they denied it altogether to women, Indians, blacks, and others. I do not minimize their failures for one moment. But it is on the basis of their great affirmations that we have been prodded to live up to their early promises about equality, and liberty and justice for all.

Remember, democracy is never a final product. The wonder about democracy is its beginning, the start. You have to start somewhere, and what these forefathers did for us was to give us some good beginnings, and even today we are still in the beginning. People are always looking for the finalization. They are looking for the ultimate. But those are standards that are out there for us to search for, to reach for.

That's why I believe that it is right and proper for political leaders to make promises. Some say the promises aren't kept, but how do you know if they are kept unless they are made? You have to have some way to judge, and I worry when some people today that are regarded as leaders in our political, economic, and social life say to us, "Now don't promise too much. Don't raise people's hopes. Don't arouse people too much." If we do that, then mediocrity becomes the standard. I think we have to do better than that.

As a matter of fact, you and I know that the Bible itself is a great promise. It isn't as if everybody has lived up to it, but it is a promise, the promise of heaven, the promise of heaven on earth in the Lord's Prayer. And everything that is worthwhile that has ever been achieved has been because somebody set some goals. Not that we always achieve those goals immediately, but we have a way to measure our performance.

I think back on that revolutionary period. If you remember, the American colonists then were one-third Tory, one-third neutral, and one-third for the Revolution. Great decisions are never made by majorities. They are made by determined minorities. Majorities merely confirm accomplishments that others made who dare to try.

We can point to the dark side of the Revolutionary War—George Washington's army struggling to survive at Valley Forge, while the Continental Congress squabbled over financing the supplies he needed; and those supplies sometimes ended up on the black market or even in the hands of the enemy.

But the important point of that period of history is that the Revolution succeeded. The important point is that Washington succeeded. The important point is that we gained our independence. All the other trivia is lost in the details of history because the great objectives were achieved.

John F. Kennedy reminded us in his Inaugural Address that the revolutionary ideas of our forefathers are still at issue, and he echoed their belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

We need to remember that. I have always thought that politics and religion, while they ought to be separated in terms of their institutionalization, must be coordinated in terms of their purpose. If love, compassion, charity, and justice mean something, and all of those beautiful words found in the religious texts mean something, then they have to mean something in terms of the political life of the people. They have to be governing standards.

Some of the groups that I have associated with from time to time are always deploring the lack of efficiency in government and they have good reason to deplore it. I think efficiency is something we should strive for. But the prime purpose of government is to do justice, and if you look back over all the great documents of human history, the Old and the New Testaments, the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Emancipation Proclamation, just to list a few, you will never find the word "efficiency." It is not there. But you will find justice, love, compassion, charity, and service. You will find all of those great forceful words that tell us about sharing and working together and cooperating. Efficiency is but a tool to be used to achieve the greater ends of justice, equality, fair play, compassion, and love.

Early in our national history, many Americans wanted to show God's love in the conduct of their own lives. They expressed that love in what they called "benevolence" and so we had great organizations like the Quakers.

They organized many reforming societies. They formed societies to educate the public about moral concern, to persuade people to change their attitudes and life-styles, and to change public policies.

They organized societies: (1) to train children for citizenship and to champion public education in the earliest days of our country; (2) to alleviate the conditions of the poor and the destitute; (3) to ease the entry problems of the thousands of immigrants coming to these shores; (4) to alleviate the conditions of the sick, the orphan, the prisoner, the emotionally disturbed; (5) to address the sufferings of displaced Indian tribes; (6) to stop the senseless practice of dueling, and to change the drinking habits of Americans; and (7) to do away with the slave trade and to outlaw slavery itself.

Religious groups did all of this. I want to remind this audience that practically every movement in this country that has been of any help to the well-being of the ordinary citizen had either the blessing or the initiation of a religious group. These things didn't come out of political parties. Political parties were compelled to accept some of these things because of great religious movements in America, and religious groups and religious people who said, "These abominations of slavery and injustice and the failure to care for the orphans and the sick and the disabled are a violation of God's covenant with man. We are going to do something about it."

I mention this to you because today we put so much emphasis upon the political party, upon the government when, in fact, you and I know that most of our problems today are not just at the govenmental level, because government is but a reflection of the body politic. Government is like a mirror, or as Adlai Stevenson said so well, "Government is like a well. What is

in it is what you draw out of the well." The people are the well. What we see today is the breakdown of the family. What we see today is the breakdown in the moral standards in individuals and groups. It reflects itself all the way up through the political structure. We are constantly trying to reform ourselves by government when, in fact, what needs to be done is to reform the government by ourselves.

After the Civil War, we found the problem of a rapid industrialization and a rapidly changing society. Religiously motivated people—Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbush, Frances Willard, John Augustine Ryan—saw people living in the misery caused by this new revolution. Affirming the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," as they put it, they fought for the rights of the people. They preached, they lectured, they wrote, they organized in order to gain a living wage for workers, to stop the exploitation of women and child labor, to restrict working hours, to improve working conditions and make them safer, and to establish compensation for disability and illness. This was before any labor group ever got around to this.

This was taking place in churches. The labor movement alone didn't initiate better working conditions; it came around to this after Christian leaders made their own profession of the desire to get rid of these practices.

We have not resolved all of our industrial problems, and they have been complicated further by the technological developments in more recent years. But these complex demands were foreseen in the 1930s by a movement called "Christian realism" and led by my good friend and teacher of us all, Reinhold Niebuhr.

Dr. Neibuhr said that we were not facing up to the hard realities. He warned us of a growing and dangerous gap between enormous wealth and pervasive poverty in this country and throughout the world. He called us to reconsider some of the basic insights of persons like James Madison who knew the necessity of checking power with power. Liberty must be the condition of order. Justice must be the criterion of law. Both liberty and justice, according to Niebuhr, are essential to domestic tranquility, to the general welfare, and in the short and long run, to the defense of the nation's vital interests.

Niebuhr taught us by his Christian commitment and compassion, by his cogent social criticism and decisiveness, and by his belief that our quest for the public good must be salted and leavened by forgiveness and the willingness always to begin again in our quest. He led us in a new quest for equality, liberty, and justice for all.

In the past few years, we have been confronted with many other problems: the continued denial of civil rights to minority groups; the pollution of our environment; the need to develop and conserve our natural resources; a crisis of confidence in governmental leadership; and a dangerous arms race in the world.

There are continuing problems. Our people confront constantly rising costs of health care. Young families cannot find homes or afford mortgages. Millions of American workers desperately hunt for jobs. Millions of our older people struggle to make ends meet on a limited income.

Too often, our cities are unable to afford the cost of maintaining public services and are left with the inevitability of decline and decay. It is within our cities today where the poorest of the poor live, where the elderly live in ever-growing numbers, where the minorities live in ever larger numbers, and those are the areas which are being neglected.

America today faces an urban crisis, the proportions of which are hardly understood by any of us. When you have vast numbers of youth without work, never having experienced work, never knowing what it is to be gainfully employed, living in a "shadow economy," that is dangerous. The rise of youth unemployment in our cities is parallel to the rise in youth crime. Eighty-five percent of all the crime committed in the United States is committed by youngsters between the ages of fourteen and twenty.

I am a politician, but I am a father, a husband, a grandfather, and a son. I don't think the government alone can build a better society. When we address fundamental social illnesses we must begin at the level of people's lives. We are constantly looking at how we can improve the government, which is indeed a proper and a very useful commitment. But the way to improve the government is to have better standards amongst ourselves.

The great movements in this country that have been helpful to us come from people, and from their churches. It came from the religious leaders, Christian and Jew. Today, I wonder if we have not lost some of that enthusiasm for doing God's will as citizens and as families.

We have had many examples of what needs to be done in our country. Today, perhaps as never before, there are issues that challenge our Christian citizenship, that demand the best that is in us in hard thinking and decisive action. But we have not been left alone in this task. We are surrounded by a "great cloud of witnesses" who call upon us to continue the pursuit of the public good in faith and love and hope, and with determination.

One of those witnesses was that great Baptist preacher, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Back in 1963, he stood at the Lincoln Memorial and expressed a dream of a better life for all of God's children. It is a dream we all share—and I know some of you remember those powerful, moving words. It is a dream that still beckons us. But now we also have to consider that dream in global terms, as Dr. King did.

We are truly living in an interdependent world, and as we celebrate our independence, we had better remember that the new factor in human relationships is the *inter*dependence.

I tell the young people in my home state of Minnesota that what happens in the Middle East may be far more important to them than anything that happens in the Middle West in terms of their day-to-day lives. And correspondingly, what happens in the Middle West, in the production of food and fiber, will have worldwide repercussions because America is a major food producer for the world. We're all tied together. We are citizens of the world.

Today the world envelops us like a tidal wave. We are exposed through newscasts and television to a constant bombardment of change and turmoil. The advent of nuclear weaponry has drastically changed the world and the way we look at the world.

Moreover, the state of the economy has brought forth unprecedented problems. Never before have we had recession and inflation at the same time, never in the history of mankind. There are no economic doctors or political economists who have ever come in contact with such complex matters! In the midst of this change, the old solutions no longer apply. Domestic remedies no longer are suitable for an interdependent world economy, and the old formulas no longer fit the new facts.

Our own prosperity in America has brought drastic change. We are forced to decide whether or not people living in democratic freedom can maintain self-discipline and high moral standards in the midst of affluence and abundance. I think that is the greatest question before us.

As St. Augustine once said, "The most miraculous thing of all is man himself," and a study of man is more important than the study of what man does. Most of us spend our time studying what we *do*. But I think we need to understand what mankind *is*, and what it is that makes us what we are, and why we act the way we do. Maybe then we will have a better understanding of some of the difficulties that we face.

The responsibilities of the United States have grown enormously since World War II, and we are still assessing our role in world affairs after our tragic involvement in Southeast Asia. We don't quite know what to do. We have been hurt. We've seen the extension of power and we have found out that didn't work. Today we are really feeling our way. But in working out the new demands of leadership in the free world—in doing rightly the things that make for a better peace—we again are guided by the principles and history of our religious tradition.

Very early in our history there were people, motivated by God's love and their desire to show his benevolence in their lives, who had a deep concern about peace throughout the world. The American Peace Society was organized in the early part of the nineteenth century. It promoted the establishment of a world court and a world assembly to deal with the affairs of nations around the world. It was far ahead of its time. We think of Churchill and Roosevelt and others as having promoted the United Nations, or Woodrow Wilson, Clemenceau, or Lloyd George as having promoted the League of Nations. On the contrary, these great movements found their genesis among religious people, among people who were motivated by Christian principles, the principles of peace and love and ministry, and then they became politically acceptable.

In the twentieth century, the religious communities were the primary supporters of the League of Nations and the United Nations. In the midst of World War II, the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches, and led by a dedicated layman, John Foster Dulles, began the vital task of alerting the public to the complex demands of building a better world out of the ashes of a devastating world conflagration. Some two decades later, challenged by the dramatic encyclical of Pope John XXIII, the historic Pacem in Terris world conference was held.

But today, as well, Christian citizens must give leadership in dealing with our worldwide problems. One of the things religious communities may do is to warn us all of our pretensions and to prick our inflated self-righteousness. Again referring to Reinhold Niebuhr, in his preamble to the little book *The Irony of American History*, he showed how we have tended to take credit for our greatness, when, in fact, much of it is due to our fortunate physical circumstance. He showed how, in the pursuit of safety and happiness, we have achieved the opposite. Despite an abundance of creaturely comforts, we have become increasingly unhappy; despite our great military and economic power, we have become increasingly unsafe.

Were he alive today, he would probably point out another irony in our situation. Precisely in response to the ideals proclaimed by our great country—ideals of an equal partnership in the community of nations, and of the rights of free people in independence—the newly formed nations of the third world, representing a major part of the earth's people, have claimed their place alongside us in international councils and in world trade.

The peoples of Africa and Asia and many of the poor of Latin America have all at once said, "Here we are—two-thirds of the world's population. Here we are with our resources. No longer can you ignore us. No longer can you treat us as subordinates or inferiors."

Even though America has never been a colonial power, by the fact of our affluence and our economy we sometimes are looked upon as one of those who was their oppressor. We have been generous at times to a fault, but we are identified regrettably all too often with those who were not that generous.

The intense spirit of nationalism in this third world, equal to our own revolutionary fervor of 200 years ago, has often placed these countries in disagreement with America's view of appropriate courses of action in international relations.

Having learned well the lessons of resource exploitation by the industrialized nations, they now employ our critical need of natural resources—whether oil, scarce minerals, or agricultural commodities unique to their climate—as leverage to bargain for an equal place in the sun of world trade, which is crucial to their economic development.

But the fundamental lesson we must learn again, the lesson which our religious communities must never let us forget, is that we cannot, in the face of all these complex challenges and seeming frustrations, retreat from our global responsibilities.

We have "soul-size" problems on our hands which call for a reevaluation of the way in which we live as Americans, which call for us to reexamine and reorder our own priorities, and which call upon us to make sacrifices for the good of the whole human race.

Now I know that is not an easy assignment. I handle here in your Congress all of the legislation that relates to foreign aid and all of the Food for Peace legislation. I am the co-author of the Food for Peace program, and I can tell you that every day it gets more difficult. Understandably, many Americans say, "Why should we help others? We have plenty to do here at home." And indeed we have plenty to do here at home. And then they say, "When we help people, they don't appreciate it anyway." Dear friends, if you're waiting for appreciation, it will be a long time coming. Most of us as parents have known a few experiences like that ourselves. But sometimes it does come. But what is

more important is to do what we think is right.

We are going to have to learn that our safety, from a very selfish point of view, is not in just protecting ourselves here at home, but in trying to build the conditions around us that are conducive to peace. Peace is not something you reach out and grab hold of. Peace is something like a cathedral that has to be built block by block. It is in the design of the Master Architect, but each generation has to add its own blocks for the building.

As for many of the needs, there is no immediate solution, but persevering patience with a plan of action and great courage and steadfastness is what is going to be required. I get discouraged at times at the United Nations, but it is an institution that we need to work within, hopefully to improve, but above all to be there to speak our piece and hopefully to find better ways of communicating between the nations of the world. It does us no good to say that those who are there are from governments that are nondemocratic, because if we are only going to talk to people in the world today who have democratic institutions, we are going to be a lonely group of people.

I believe we must extend these great principles of democracy. But our principles will be judged by our deeds.

With respect to the fundamental conflict in principles in which we must continue to engage—the conflict between Communism and democracy—we must make a realistic effort to negotiate agreements with, for example, the Soviet Union, for the further control of nuclear weapons. But we must never back away from the ideological conflict. We have got something to believe in. I don't happen to believe people really want to live under a totalitarian regime, if there are ways of making democratic principles operative. I have seen what happens in countries where the so-called democratic political parties have been abysmally inept and corrupt. Finally people in disgust turn away.

Part of the frustration in America today, part of the disenchantment, is that they have seen institutions and individuals in government that have failed them, failed them in every sense of the word, and they turn off. And when they turn off, sometimes they listen to the voices of those who promise easy solutions. This has happened in every country of the world. When people lose faith in those who profess democracy, they can't escape, they are still there. They live in the countryside, they live in the towns, they know there has to be some kind of government, and they give themselves all too quickly to those who offer simple solutions. It is a very complex problem, but the solution often is the end of democracy.

There is one last thing that I want to leave with you, which I consider an essential responsibility of citizenship. That is hope. I sense there is much cynicism, some desperation, and some despair, abroad in the land today.

It is only natural that during our Bicentennial we should look backward, hopefully to learn from the past. But I believe that our greatest challenge is to look forward.

We live by faith. We live by hope. We live by love. We cannot presume that we have the knowledge and will to reach the Promised Land and to resolve all of our national and international problems overnight. I think it is imperative that we understand that there are some problems that are beyond our immediate solution and beyond any solution. One of the reasons that religion has prevailed and one of the reasons that we believe in God Almighty is that we know there are some problems that we humans cannot solve alone. And that is fundamental to our whole national history, and fundamental to the history of millions of people throughout the ages.

But I am an optimist and I've always been one, and I refuse to be intimidated by the size of our problems or by the possibility of making mistakes or to give up because I do not have the final answer to our problems. I refuse to be a cynic and I refuse to despair. I believe we are on a great pilgrimage toward molding a better nation and world.

I believe that our religious communities have an opportunity now as in the early days of our republic to give us some sense of perspective, to help us understand the meaning of this new pilgrimage on which we enter. The parish priest, the circuit rider, the lay preacher were to be found wherever the wagons had halted to form a community on the American frontier in the last century. Our religious communities were an integral part of the pioneer spirit of America, strengthening its moral fiber, searching for the ways of God with men in a new land and a totally new situation.

Today we have too few people who are willing to dare, to try. Today people want to play it safe. People who play it safe are going no place.

We face incredible difficulties in this country, but when I look back over the beginning of this republic, the problems that we have today in proportion to those earlier days were not that much, because we have so much more to deal with.

We are the greatest country on the face of the earth that gives more opportunities to more people, and continues to extend opportunities.

Democracy is not perfect. Winston Churchill put it well. He said, "Democracy is the worst possible form of government except all others that have been tried from time to time." Keep that in mind and if we do not lose our faith, I think then we will be doing quite well.

Franklin Roosevelt said:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with a strong and active faith. . . . I do not believe that the era of the pioneer is at an end. I only believe that the area for pioneering has changed. The country needs bold, persistent experimentation. . . .

We are going to have to experiment with how to get seven to eight million people who are unemployed back to earning a living for themselves. We are going to have to experiment with how to get rid of a welfare program that is an indignity to the people who receive it and a terrible burden upon the taxpayers who have to provide it. We ae going to have to experiment with how to find new sources of energy so that we are no longer captive to the OPEC countries.

There are 1,001 things that need doing and we are not going to get them done unless we dare to try. And if we make a mistake, so what? We learn from our mistakes. What they represent are building blocks of a better tomorrow.

We are now 200 years old as a people and yet we are a young people. In celebrating our birthday in this Bicentennial year we shall probably be engaged in some local and national birthday ceremonies and parties. But we would do well to remember the words of Adlai Stevenson in the conclusion of his book *Call to Greatness:*

> Now at maturity we should shoulder the heaviest burdens of greatness, for in the last analysis the epic struggle for our civilization, for government by the consent of the governed, will be determined by what Americans are capable of. In bearing burdens, in ennobling new duties of citizenship, is the greatness of men and nations measured, not in pomp and circumstances.

The truth is we must judge ourselves on the basis of our own strength. We have our own standards and we need to set our goals and set them high. We need to stretch evey day of our lives to see that those standards are reached. You and I can believe that we can do better than we are doing today.

Long before Stevenson spoke his words, the prophet Micah warned about pomp and circumstance and ceremony. He said that they signify nothing. His words are engraved on the walls of the Library of Congress for all of us to read this Bicentennial year, and as a reminder of our responsibilities of citizenship: ". . . What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:8). Now if that isn't about as good a charge as you can get as to what you ought to be doing and what I ought to be doing, I don't know where you're going to find one. An old Welsh hymn, full of thunder and determination of soldiers marching into combat, puts the case well in a verse that reads:

We are living, we are dwelling
in a grand and awful time.
In an age on ages telling,
to be living is sublime.

This is an age that will determine the course of the future, for better or for worse. We must make the most of our time, because time is neutral. It is how you use it.

The hour is right, and God willing, the promise of America will become a reality for all of the world. That promise is clear; life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

So I come before you as an exponent of living. I believe in it! And I believe it ought to be lived to the utmost. I think the purpose of life is action for the good of ourselves and for the good of what the Lord Almighty gave us to work with.

ON GIVING A CERTAIN SOUND

L. D. Johnson

There may never have been a time in our history when so many have said so much that was heard by so few. The nation suffers from a crisis of confidence in leadership, with preachers and politicians close to the top of the list of those not taken seriously.

What is the matter, that the more we talk the more skeptical the people become? We are not deficient in verbal skills. We build admirable paragraphs filled with high-sounding words, but our eloquence falls on deaf ears. The citizenry's chronic boredom and/or despair reflects not only its lack of self-discipline but also the belief that our character does not match our rhetoric. What a pity that with the availability of the electronic miracle of instantaneous global communication nobody has anything to say that people will believe.

A line from our brother, Paul, is appropriate to the occasion. He wrote it in a letter to a small, argumentative, feuding congregation struggling to free itself from domination by its culture in Corinth, Greece, mid-first century A.D. Religious and philosophical voices clamoring to be heard filled the city with a bewildering babble. Popular philosophical and ethical maxims could be read on placards along the street. Cults and mysteries flourished. In the church itself the people divided up into schisms to declare unswerving loyalty to Peter, or Apollos, or Paul, or even Christ. Not the least among them were those who claimed a kind of spiritual superiority because they spoke in tongues. On the hill above this religious and ethical carnival stood the Temple of Aphrodite, goddess of sexual passion. In that cacophany of moral confusion Paul, their spiritual mentor, wrote this admonition: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Corinthians 14:8).

Having come to Washington in this historic year to talk about Christian citizenship in 1976, with some of the country's most influential figures on the platform, dare we hope for something more substantial than banalities and more challenging than platitudes? In short, is it possible to send forth from this meeting a clear and certain sound so that people across the land may pick up again the beat and rhythm of the music of "one nation under God"? If anybody knows the right note, let him give it out plainly. Maybe it will be heard above the babble of hollow rhetoric and empty promise.

No doubt we shall talk a lot about morality in government, industry, and private life. Morality is once more an "in" subject in this country, provided it be carefully phrased so as not to inhibit anyone's personal behavior or lower his living standard or adversely affect the advocate's rating at the polls. In strange places podiums have been converted into pulpits, and some of the most unlikely for the role are taking texts. Almost any day you can see them descending some Mt. Sinai, waving the Ten Commandments in one hand and the American Constitution in the other.

But a lot of people sense that they have read that script before, more than once, and suspect that the reforms it calls for are more apparent than real. Whenever justice and righteousness come dressed in the latest fashion and surrounded by a host of self-serving admirers, there is good reason to suspect that it is a case of mistaken identity. Popular morality, like popular religion, is nearly always a shallow imitation of the real thing.

If we are not to succumb to those twin maladies of a dying culture, apathy and cynicism, where do we find a remedy? In the midst of bewildering ambiguity, who can say the unambiguous word? Who can give

the certain sound? That, I take, is the primary responsibility of every person who aspires to leadership. It is the task of the preacher and the President, the Congressman and the chaplain. It is the task of the Christian Life Commission. And it is the task of this convocation, indeed of all trusted and privileged persons in the civilizing process. Those who have the ability to initiate change for the common good have also the responsibility.

Archibald Cox, addressing the American Bar Association a couple of years ago, issued such a call to the legal profession. He said it is no longer acceptable that the profession go along emulating the Three Monkeys: "Hear no evil, See no evil, Speak no evil." He therefore summoned the law schools and bar "to the long, arduous and detailed work of developing the moral order and sense of long-range purposes that prevent abuse of power and build confidence in the legal and political system. . . . Looking back over the descending spiral that led to Watergate, we should have learned that in our enormously complex society . . . the moral precepts and sense of ultimate purposes necessary to preserve and renew . . . a civilized society require more steadfast attention."

What Cox said to the legal profession must certainly be no less applicable to the Christian citizen. Moral and spiritual confusion or neutrality simply will not do. The times require a "certain sound." Where, if not here, can it be heard?

The Myth of "Bigger and Better"

I hope that somebody here is going to give a certain sound about the absolute necessity that we re-examine the American myth of "bigger and better forever." Someone with a chance to be heard must raise the right questions about the moral and ethical validity of our economy of overconsumption in the midst of a hungry world. For generations it has been assumed that natural resources are boundless. Now it is no secret that they are sharply limited. Indeed, now we know that the outer limits of some of the crucial ones are measured in terms of a few decades at best. From the moral standpoint, if not the pragmatic, one must ask how long the United States, with 6 percent of the world's population, can go on consuming 35 percent of the world's resources. Sooner or later, we shall have to sit down to a table of consequences.

This extravagant standard of living, making most of us fabulously rich by comparison with the vast majority of the rest of the people of the earth, and cited by many as the surest evidence of divine approval of "the American Way," has rested on assumptions not only ethically questionable but which now seem to be also economically untenable. Besides erroneously assuming an endless supply of energy to run our machines we assumed that man's basic acquisitiveness would assure his perpetual appetite for more material goods, that such acquisition would make him more content, and that a system of built-in obsolescence and waste would keep the whole beautiful wheel of production turning. And if it slows down too much you can always get it going again by stirring anger and fear in people so that they consent to the building of war machines that cost billions in the earth's precious and irreplaceable resources. If necessary, you can have a war, or help somebody with theirs, so that what you have in stock can be replaced with newer, costlier and deadlier weapons.

This is called good business, under the illusion that the more you manufacture, sell and discard—cluttering the earth (and now outer space as well) with junk and garbage—the better off everybody is. To assist this mass self-deception is an advertising business costing billions and at its crassest, subverting nearly every ethical principle known to man to dupe people into buying what they neither need nor can afford. We have so trained ourselves to expect instant gratification that we salivate like Pavlov's dogs upon the signal of Madison Avenue. This may be our most significant and most disastrous bequest to our children. Nobody wants to say or hear, "No."

Somebody has to raise the question about the morality of such a life-style. What do we do, just go on, hell-bent-for-election, spend-spend-spend and consume-consume-consume, until the well goes dry and one fine winter morning we awaken with the power cut off and the store closed and the factory shut down? Who will say, "Hey, wait! We have to take a look down the road"? Who will call attention to our hungry brothers and sisters? Who will question the sanity, let alone the morality, of a nation which spends on past, present, and future wars thirteen times as much as it spends on the education of its children, and many times what it spends on housing and community development?

The Worship of Winning

A second area in which there is great moral confusion is our preoccupation with and worship of success as primary in our system of values. In a society where winning is not just the best thing but the only thing and failure the only unpardonable offense, we need not be surprised that the line between truth and falsehood, opportunism and genuine service, straightforwardness and duplicity, becomes obscured.

People who have no higher principle than pragmatism, who believe in their heart of hearts that the bottom line must always carry a guarantee of finishing first, may be expected to adopt moral ambiguity, persuading themselves that the end justifies the means. People obsessed with success, who have no concern for what happens to their neighbors so long as it does not cramp their own style, may not be expected voluntarily to accept less of the luxuries of life so that others may have some of the necessities.

The success syndrome is not confined to the counter or the counting house, to the White House or the church house. Creeping cynicism about moral principle pervades this culture. It makes allowance for fixing prices, bribing government officials to obtain favorable treatment or to sell airplanes, or to ship short-weighted, weevil-infested, trashy wheat to other nations who purchase our surplus. In the name of national security it excuses breaking the law and engaging in assassination. It lets us say, "You can't be too finicky about the niceties when the stakes are high."

And it is alarming that so many of us are neither chagrined nor dismayed. "Watergate," like "Waterloo," may become the word-symbol for the end of a way of life that began in hopefulness and idealism, but which is in danger of ending with a whimper of self-preoccupation. In testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee a couple of years ago, Admiral Rickover

summed up his concern about the nation's declining sense of morals along with its consuming preoccupation with personal comfort, in these words: "We find ourselves a people whose bellies are full, but whose spirits are empty." Who will give the word that fills empty spirits?

Translating the Language of Justice

Let us sound the certain note about our failure to translate the biblical principle of justice and righteousness into the language of our common life. In a country which calls itself "one nation under God," we have not become one nation and we are by no means under God. Instead of being one nation we are yearly widening the gap between the haves and the have-nots, the rich getting richer and the poor becoming more and more frustrated and disillusioned about our unkept promises. With welfare checks and food stamps we buy people's acquiescence to being second-class citizens and deaden their desire to share in the action of the American dream of dignity and interdependence.

Reintroduce us to the Prophet Amos. "Listen to this," he shouted in Israel's religious capital, "you men who crush the humble, and oppress the poor . . . You cheat by tampering with the scales . . . to buy the needy for a pair of shoes . . . and sell them the refuse of the wheat . . . Woe to the careless citizens . . . , lolling on their ivory divans, sprawling on their couches, dining off fresh lamb and fatted veal, crooning to the music of the lute, lapping wine by the bowlful, and using for ointment the best of the oil—with never a single thought for the bleeding wounds of the nation." It is not more religion that God wants, said Amos, it is better religion. It is not "solemn assemblies" that he delights in, "but let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everflowing stream" (Amos 5:24, RSV). That, friends, is a certain sound. Of course, they ran Amos out of Bethel and it might happen again if a prophet of God were among us.

Decline in Personal Integrity

Somebody here must sound a certain note about the dismaying decline this country is experiencing in personal integrity. We have witnessed a fundamental shift in the concept of sexual morality. Prisoners of war home from Vietnam returned to find that they were modern Rip Van Winkles, not only in the radical changes in clothing and life-style, food prices and real estate values, but also in American sex mores. They came back to discover that in a few short years we had progressed to nudity and simulated sexual intercourse on the Broadway stage, X-rated movies depicting in living color explicit sexual acts in the neighborhood theater or drive-in, and books and magazines on the drugstore newsstand that deal with every conceivable form of sexual perversion, illustrated with pictures. They found their teenage daughters and sisters on the Pill, and sexual continence before marriage and fidelity afterward under derision. Further, many found that their own marriages had disintegrated in their absence, and that the divorce rates were skyrocketing. Perhaps we have been so close to the situation that we have not realized the dramatic nature of this shift in sexual morality. But is it not time for someone to sound a certain note about the Christian view of sex and marriage?

Of course, personal morality is more than sexual behavior. We have become a nation of small time chiselers. Individual acts of dishonesty, cheating, manipulation, and outright illegality at the national level are the visible tip of the iceberg of widespread erosion of the standards of personal morality. Leadership in government is the reflection of a relativistic culture. We have no better government because we are no better ourselves. As someone once put it, there is no way to make a good omelet with rotten eggs.

There is a special temptation for people like ourselves to evade the issue of personal morality because of our concern for big problems. We are like college students who call a rally to protest the destruction of the environment and, while passing resolutions against the despoilers, litter the meeting place with their own garbage. But students have no corner on hypocrisy. How many of us give sacrificially to put missionaries in Africa while making sure that no black family moves into our block?

Dostoevski speaks of us when in *The Brothers Karamazov* he reports an old doctor saying: "I love humanity, but I can't help being surprised at myself; the more I love humanity in general the less I love men in particular. On the other hand, it invariably happened that the more I hated men individually, the more ardent became my love for humanity at large." That old man has a lot of relatives among us.

Corporate Morality

But there is another side to Christian morality besides the personal and individual. I am not just one person; I am a member of a society in which I have appropriate responsibility. Nobody in our time put this plainer than did Reinhold Niebuhr forty years ago in *Moral Man and Immoral Society.* Many a person correct in personal rectitude refuses to acknowledge his responsibility for the public character of his society. It would not be enough, Niebuhr said, to practice personal uprightness, even if you could. You have to be concerned about your place in a society where lying, viciousness, exploitation, and dishonesty are ruining the lives of multitudes.

We finally got out of Vietnam, a war few now defend. But where were we Christians five, six, or eight years ago, when that war was being pursued to the division of the country and the alienation and loss of thousands of its most idealistic and bright young people?

There probably is not a city in America where the slumlords are not at the same time stalwart pillars of some church. Or who is not a stockholder in a corporation which is devouring the land and exploiting people? What kind of slippage exists between profession and practice that we do not see these things as outrageous contradictions? We need not excuse ourselves because we own no slum dwellings and have carefully selected our stock portfolio. We are voting members of a citizenry whose record on housing is a moral disgrace. We build superhighways, airplanes that outdistance sound, nuclear bombs that can wipe out life on the planet, rockets that shoot men to the moon with pinpoint accuracy. But no one can figure out a way to save the cities. Do we suffer from a national brain drain, or is there a failure

to grasp the meaning of Christian morality as responsibility for the public good?

What I am appealing for is a less exclusive sense of morality. National priorities are a matter of Christian morality. Government is a matter of Christian morality. Gross national product is a matter for the concern of the Christian moralist. Advertising is a Christian moral issue, as well as illicit sex, liquor drinking, gambling and, among some of us—bless our narrowness—dancing!

Martin Luther King's sermon on the Jericho Road bears re-preaching again and again. It is not enough to bind up the wounds of the victim of robbers. We must do something to rid the road of robbers. We must try to change these vicious parasites into law-abiding and productive citizens. Our view of morality has been too narrow-gauged.

"The Angelic Fallacy"

There is one other place where I hope this conference will sound a certain note. This is on the fundamental issue of man's sinful state and his need of divine redemption. Hardheaded old Karl Menninger, out of more than half a century of dealing with human nature as a psychotherapist, has asked the right question when he entitled his latest book, *Whatever Happened to Sin?* What indeed? We have allowed ourselves to be taken in by the "angelic fallacy," the native assumption that man is a potential angel needing only to be informed in order to be delivered from the bondage of destructive exploitation of himself and his brothers.

The people of the Bible knew better. Hence they talked about sin and the redemptive love of God in Christ. And our forefathers knew better. They were not so simpleminded as to put unchecked power into the hands of any person or group because they knew that none of us can be trusted with the exercise of power unless there is someone to call us to account. Imagine how George Washington would have snorted at the notion of the "Sovereign Presidency!" American democracy was built upon the experience that people are corruptible and that political power is a fearful corrupter.

To be sure, there is moral beauty and grandeur in the human situation. But there are also greed, violence, dispossession, murder, exploitation, and inequity. Cain still murders his brother Abel because he hates and envies him. David still commits adultery. Absalom still rebels against his father. Elijah still flees before the wrath of a hostile monarch, and Jeremiah still preaches from jail. Human nature does not change. It can only be redeemed.

In a fine piece he called "Pollyanna Is a Blind Queen," Michael Novak has denounced the harmful myth of human goodness:

> We cannot bring a stronger morality to public places, nor increase even by a little the circle of morality in our own private lives unless first of all we clear the mists of false innocence from our eyes. . . . The first moral lesson is that we are more self-deceived than we can bring ourselves to face. . . . The aim of life is to enter combat with the self-deceptions of our own heart and to create at least a few more acts of honesty, courage, freedom, and compassion than would otherwise break the surface of untruth and mediocrity.

Well, there it is—to give a certain sound about the American myth of "bigger and better forever"; to give a certain sound about our American worship of success as primary in our system of values; to give a certain sound about our failure to translate the biblical principle of justice and righteousness into the language of our common life; to give a certain sound about the erosion of personal and corporate morality in this country; and to give a certain sound about man's need for redemption, not merely reformation.

That could be quite an agenda for this conference. Maybe too much. I remember some sentences written by that same disturbing Niebuhr, this time in 1925 in his little book, *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic.* He wrote:

> When I sit through a church conference, I begin to see a little more clearly, why religion is on the whole so impotent ethically, why the achievements of the church are so meager compared to its moral pretensions. . . . The church conference begins and ends by attempting to arouse an emotion of the ideal, usually in terms of personal loyalty to the person of Jesus, but very little is done to attach the emotion to specific tasks and projects.

To be painfully specific is both the hardest and the most redemptive thing we can do for each other. Remember John the Baptist. What an evangelist! The whole country turned out to hear him preach. But he didn't fly off into the wild blue yonder with rhetorical pronouncements about the beauty of holiness and the holiness of beauty. "What shall we do?" they cried in response to his call to repent. Have you considered his down-to-earth stuff? "If you have two coats, give one to somebody who has none. If you have food, share it with somebody who is hungry. You tax collectors, stop gouging the people. You soldiers, quit strong-arming people by police brutality and stop making up for your poor wages by taking it out of the hides of the helpless."

Now that is evangelistic preaching that produces changes in the moral life of people who hear. But a greater than John is among us. He says, "Why do you go on calling me 'Lord, Lord,' but don't do the things that I say?" That seems specific enough. Or as Paul put it to the Corinthians, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Corinthians 14:8). Let there be heard from this gathering a certain sound.

CHRISTIAN MORALS AND ECONOMIC POLICIES

J. Irwin Miller

This country of ours is in a mess . . . You and I hear this statement on every hand. We hear it from businessmen, workers, political candidates, youth. It contrasts curiously with the background noise of the Bicentennial. And I think it is most charitably in-

terpreted as meaning: "Sure, we are a great country. We love it, have pride in it, but we also have problems of a kind I've never seen before, and we don't seem to know what to do about them. In a lot of disturbing ways we seem to be slipping."

There are also less charitable definitions, and few of us will describe the mess in the same terms. The mess is neither so visible nor so immediate nor so dramatic as our mess was in 1814 when Washington was captured and the White House burned, nor as in 1860 when the Union fell apart, nor as in 1930 when 25 percent of the working force was unemployed.

For some of us our mess consists in the concern that we may no longer be "Number One." The Russians have gained on us in military power and are outspending us. We have just lost a war—the longest we ever fought. Anti-Americanism flourishes around the world.

For others our mess is mainly domestic and economic. Our major cities are broke—or nearly broke. Our federal government, with its annual deficits of $60 billion, seems equally broke, a fact obscured only by its power to print money. We are no longer self-sufficient. Without a change in our consumption habits we shall be out of oil in twenty-five years, and there are some fifteen to twenty vital raw materials of which we no longer have adequate reserves within our own borders. With consumption increasing unabated and shortages growing, the persistence of inflation seems a certainty, eroding the living standards of each of us, rich and poor alike.

For still others our mess is defined mainly in human terms.

Corruption:

Fifty major corporations discovered making bribes and illegal contributions.

A whole national administration violating the laws, lying to the people, attempting a massive cover-up.

Unemployment:

A persistent failure by our free enterprise system to offer steady and meaningful work to all willing and able to work.

We seem to cure unemployment with inflation, inflation with unemployment. Boom and bust is our way of life, and the swing of the pendulum may well be increasing.

Maldistribution of wealth:

The majority of us has an overeating problem and patronizes the diet industry, while in the South, Southwest, and border states there still exist whole areas of hunger and poverty and lack of opportunity.

Discrimination:

In the land of equal opportunity where it is "self-evident; that all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights," many are still denied education, diet, access to health care, job opportunities, simply because of their color, or their race, or their sex, or their religion. Even Christian churches who are taught that "God shows no partiality" show color partiality in admitting members.

But enough about our worrisome present condition. In sum it now appears for the first time to Americans that future material progress will not necessarily be automatic, that a nation of individuals who love freedom will not necessarily act lawfully and responsibly toward each other when given that freedom, and that an affluent majority is less than eager to open to excluded minorities the opportunity to share in the affluence which the majority gained simply through accident of birth.

I think that not a one of us doubts our competence and capability to resolve these threatening problems. We already possess technical skills more than adequate to feed every American well, and perhaps many others in addition. We know how to deliver the best health care in the world. We lead in the possession of analytical, planning, management skills, and excel all others in our ability to plan and execute ventures of great size and complexity. However large and complex our government, few doubt that we have the skills to deliver the public services required, and to bring our income and expenses into balance. Few doubt that, with concerted effort, we could within reasonable time achieve a true energy balance. It is not at all that we stand helpless before our problems, that we can do nothing about our mess. It is rather that we will not.

The once enthusiastic, booster, go-getting Americans, the most lively people on the planet, seem reconciled to decline, and to acquiesce in its slow coming. Listen to the words of two persons who lived in another time and spoke to other generations.

The first is an ancient Roman, Livy, speaking to his own generation:

> I do honestly believe that no country has ever been greater and purer than ours, or richer in good citizens and noble deeds.
>
> None has been free for so many generations from the vices of avarice and luxury. Nowhere have thrift and plain living been for so long held in such esteem.
>
> Indeed proverty with us went hand in hand with contentment. Of late years, however, wealth has made us greedy, and self-indulgence has brought us, through every form of sensual excess, to be, if I may so put it, in love with death, both individual and collective.

Our second voice is that of our own poet, Walt Whitman:

> Long, too long, America, travelling roads all even and peaceful, you learned from joys and prosperity only. But now, Oh now, to learn from crisis of anguish. Advancing, grappling with direst fate, and recoiling not.
>
> And now to conceive and show to the world what your children en-masse really are. . . .

We cannot truly say that today we as a people are eager to "grapple with direst fate, recoiling not," nor excited to show to the world "what Americans really are." Instead, our disposition, as shown in our dinner conversations, is to accept decline. "Our children won't have it as good as we did." "There's no hope for the big cities." "Nobody can run the govern-

ment any more." With all the skills and tools in hand to construct the greatest of human communities in brand new times under brand new circumstances, we seem, in Livy's phrase, to have "chosen death, individual and collective."

So now we have to ask, in such a world at such a time, what place is there for Christianity? To what is a Christian called in such a time?

Well, as you know, I am a businessman, not a theologian. But a businessman and a free-enterpriser is supposed to be a risk-taker; so I will risk venturing an answer to my question, fully aware that any answer compressed into the time available this afternoon will be inadequately supported and open to the further charge of being simplistic. The risk is compounded by the fact that an untutored layman is exposing himself to the vast array of theological weaponry possessed by the professionals in this audience.

Anyway, here goes: One of the most significant facts about Christianity is that Christ did not himself leave us a single written word. It was not because he could not. Reliable evidence of his ability to read and write exists. It strains credibility to imagine that he overlooked the usefulness of setting down written instructions so clear as to have resolved the conflicts which never cease to divide Christians. Alone among the founders of world religions he chose to leave nothing more than an example and a memory.

Instead of inquiring into the overwhelming significance of this choice, Christians have jumped to correct what they consider to have been Christ's error in judgment. They compose creeds. They institutionalize forms. And then they argue endlessly over their own constructions, having nothing to do with those who put together and follow other compositions and constructions.

Hundreds of reminiscences about Christ were set down. Most were lost—maybe the most important ones. Even these were mainly written long after the crucifixion.

Of all the Christian letters and reminiscences, at least 150 survived to the fourth century. Three hundred years after the crucifixion the Church of Rome decided which books to put their seal upon, and which not, though it was another 300 years before the process was finally concluded, and Eastern and Western churches were in agreement. Now I am one of those who think that in general the early bishops made a remarkably good choice. But it seems also important to me not to forget that Christianity flourished and spread before Christians had access to all the books of our New Testament, and that what has been handed on to us is not a code, such as we find explicitly formulated in parts of the Old Testament, but rather letters for specific occasions, and sermons, and documents prepared in response to a particular occasion, and the ancient equivalent of today's tape-recorded interview. It should be no surprise to any of us that, if Christians are determined to make of this a precise and orderly (as humans consider precision and order) blueprint for Christian practice and observance, there is no hope ever of agreement among us. The spectacular division among Christians is a predictable end product of such a human procedure.

What is it that divides Christians, and on occasion has even made them imprison and kill one another? Is it the validity of the command to love God and neighbor? Or the command "to be one"? Is it the command to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick? Not at all. Our obedience in these matters may be half-hearted, even at times nonexistent, but we do not split over admission of their validity.

Our first rousing split was over the date of Easter. Today groups of us divide over—

- Whose hand touches whose head when a young person is ordained.
- Which way the water of baptism is administered.
- How the communion is presented, and how often.

What would be the reaction to all this of a Christ who reserved his bitterest words, not for murderers, thieves, adulterers, but for the good, well-behaved Pharisees and their preoccupation with the forms of religion rather than its substance?

What would be the diagnosis of a perceptive psychologist today, as he observed Christians placing on the back burner all those difficult commandments, a strong witness to which might cause them—

- To lose members,
- To give up some cherished comforts,
- To receive criticism and loss of position,

and instead identify their own Christian witness with raising the local budget, with the numbers game in the pews and Sunday School rooms, with harmless but self-centered search for "personal spirituality"?

Is it any wonder that a worried nation does not seek leadership from the Church today? Perhaps you feel I am being considerably less than fair. Is it not enough, you say,

> To admonish individual men and women to love God, love their neighbor, to be Christ-like in their personal lives, go to church, and give to missions?

If we all do these things, won't the world's problems automatically be solved?

To this I can reply only that it is always correct so to admonish individuals, but today it is clearly not enough. Let me give you my own reasons for that statement. Any comprehensive reading of the New Testament canon discloses its astonishing pragmatism. If only Christ had urged us to *ideal* behavior, we would all feel so very much better. We could each say to himself "Well, I am trying, but after all I am human; so you can't expect perfection."

But Christ does not urge us to the pursuit of the impossible. On every recorded occasion his manner is such as to say, "You know yourself that this is true. Look around you. The evidence is there." Take the Beatitudes. The use of the present tense says:

> There *are* persons in this world who mourn, who are meek, who are merciful, who are peacemakers. Observe them. Are they not blessed, which is to say happy?

The device of the parable is to force the hearer to give his own answer, on the assumption that he knew it all the time. The inescapable message is that there are laws of human behavior and the human spirit that are as inexorable as those of the physical world. The law of gravity is not an ideal. If we attempt to dis-

obey it, the penalty is immediate and predictable, Christ reminds us that the same holds true for the laws of human behavior, and that, if we will only look, we will see so ourselves. The penalty for greed, selfishness, cold-heartedness, hatred is as predictable as the penalty for breathing carbon monoxide, and the morning newspaper gives us our evidence every day.

Persons throughout recorded history have sensed this in greater or less degree, and that is why we run across those haunting premonitions of Christianity among the Greeks and others. It is why you find non-Christians today unwittingly expressing Christian teachings—almost in Christian words. Consider the following three statements: The first is from Aristotle, and, since I have to quote it from memory, I cannot vouch as to its literal accuracy:

> Democracy is not possible unless each of its citizens is as capable of outrage at injustice to another as he is of outrage at injustice to himself.

Then we have the Apostle Paul:

> For you were called to freedom, brethren. Only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." But if you bite and devour one another take heed that you are not consumed by one another (Galatians 5:13-15, RSV).

And finally we come to an observation which reached my desk only this past week. It is entitled "The Unstable Society and Its Leadership: A Special Commentary Published by the Boston Consulting Group":

> It is the balance between cooperation and competition that stabilizes any social activity. Cooperation is necessary for productivity. Cooperation requires subordination of the individual to the society. Yet cooperation must produce social benefits to make that subordination a willing and voluntary one that can be enforced by social rewards and punishments.

Each of these three in his own way has laid hold of the same law of human behavior. Each wants to communicate what he has perceived. As is so often the case, however, it is the businessman who in his tangled verbiage succeeds only in confusing. For communication of power and conviction it would be hard to beat Paul's sentence,

> But if you bite and devour one another take heed that you are not consumed by one another.

A nineteenth-century English poet said:

> Christians were on the earth before Christ was born, Thousands of years ago men dared to die, loving their enemies, and wondered why.

Paul confirms this in Romans:

> When Gentiles who have not the law do by nature what the law requires, they are a law to themselves. . . . They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts (2:14-15a, RSV).

Today we Americans are busily hoping that in at least some important areas Christian teaching isn't so—that the laws of individual human behavior do not apply. If Christian teaching, however, is valid, and if Christians believe in its validity, then our nation must be considered to be truly on a perilous course, headed for highly predictable disaster. Given all that, one must ask, "Why so silent the church?"

Let me specify what I mean by this reasoning. Where are Americans pretending that Christian teaching doesn't apply? American businessmen are saying that, once you organize human beings into a collective group called a business organization, it is not practical to "Love your neighbor as yourself." When your neighbor is the consumer, you will go broke, if only you, and none of your competitors, tell him in your advertising all the things you would like to know about the product or service, if you were the buyer. When your neighbor is a foreign customer, you can short-weight him if you are a grain company, because others do it. You can bribe his representatives to get the order, because others do it. You can make illegal political contributions because others do it. You can pollute the streams and the air, because others do it.

Milton Friedman, a most respected American economist, gives one of the best definitions of a current point of view:

> Only people can have responsibilities. Business as a whole cannot be said to have responsibilities. The doctrine of social responsibilities is a fundamentally subversive doctrine. In a free society there is one and only one social responsibility of business—to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game.

American public officials are saying that, provided you organize human beings into a collective group called a government or nation, it is acceptable, under the necessity of secrecy, to tell the people that there are no Americans in Laos, or no bombing in Cambodia, while all the time Americans are flooding into Laos, and the bombs are dropping on Cambodia. It is O.K. to form plans to assassinate or to depose the ruler of a "neighbor" nation whose attitudes you don't like.

Americans are saying that, provided you consider yourselves collectively as a generation, you can continue to consume finite and scarce resources at an exponential rate, clearly diminishing the probable quality of life for their "neighbor" generation, their own children. Or, provided you consider yourselves collectively as the majority, there will be no penalty involved for you if you continue to deny access to your affluence and your privilege to others, who are excluded from the majority only by accident of birth, color, race, or sex.

All of us share, in greater or less degree, in the hope that human collective behavior is not always subject to the laws which we very well know apply to human individual behavior. We have a sneaking hope to get by. But the message of the prophets and the message of Jesus has never been "Be good because you ought to be, even though it's not much fun." The frightening message instead is: "Repent, lest you perish."

This nation will perish unless relatively soon it achieves energy balance, which is to say unless it

reaches a point where at the end of each year its known energy reserve potential is as great as it was at the beginning of the year.

Energy balance is a matter for Christian concern. It involves cheating future generations, even risking the survival of the society so that we might live well in 1976. The Church has cause to speak on energy. It has a Christian compulsion to judge proposals and programs and to give the prophet's warning if they are not well and responsibly conceived. To do this in these complex and technical times, however, the Church will not be heard unless it speaks with competence as well as concern.

American business, as we now know it, will perish unless our nation can provide simultaneously meaningful jobs for every American willing and able to work—and stable prices of goods and services. If inflation can be controlled only by keeping out of work those citizens least able to bear unemployment, if that is the best our current system can do, it will perish. Whether it is succeeded by something better or worse, it will nevertheless perish, just as the feudal system perished, and the mercantile system perished when they failed to serve men well and fairly. Here too the Prophet's warning is needed for a collective group in the society, and once again, "Repent lest you perish" is not enough. The Church must develop a competence to judge solutions such that it will be sought and heard during the process of change.

American government—federal, state, local—as we know it, will perish unless it begins to supply evenly and fairly throughout the country the services in both quality and quantity which each of its citizens truly need. At the same time it will perish if it does not simultaneously become and remain fiscally solvent, and maintain a stable coinage. The prophet's warning is needed here by the citizen who wants the services but doesn't want to pay their cost, pushing bankruptcy onto the "neighbor" generation, his children, or who wants these services for himself and cares less about their provision to his neighbors, black, chicano, the poor and deprived of every community. But the warning is equally needed by the political leader who fails in courage to raise taxes if taxes are needed, to eliminate waste and duplication, and to humanize performance everywhere. Once again "Repent lest you perish" is not enough.

The Church, to be heard and respected, must have the informed competence to judge reactions, proposals, and programs—to distinguish between what is cynical and shortsighted, and what is thoughtful and moral.

So we have our country in a mess, as we say. By this we mean that conditions have suddenly changed before our eyes, that new and formidable problems have emerged. It does not appear that old responses are working. And our answer? Even though all the tools and resources of success are in our hands, we are turning inward trying in the pejorative Christian phrase "To save our lives," and in so doing we are courting disaster.

The need for the Church is clear. The prophetic role is not one to which either Christians or their churches are unaccustomed. But the prophetic manner which this day calls for is one from which the Church shrinks and for which she is generally unprepared.

I would guess three things are required of Christians if we are to be considered to have acted responsibly in these times. The first is that we must offer in our own behavior an example of what we preach. Collectively we must impoverish ourselves, if need be, in service to those in every kind of need anywhere. Collectively we must demonstrate shame at our petty divisions and quarrels over details of form, and join hands with all others who profess to love the Lord, granting them happily the privilege of worshipping and serving as they wish, and finding in this diversity richness rather than schism. We must by example offer convincing evidence of our Christian commitment.

Second, we must develop a competence which we are not now perceived to have. Two thousand years ago one understood the imperative of offering a cup of cold water to the man by the roadside who had fallen among thieves. Today that "neighbor" may be a whole community, an area, or even a developing nation. The equivalent for them of a cup of cold water will most likely be a complex program to develop a water system, transportation system, or limit pollution to acceptable levels. Some programs proposed may be exploitive, or disastrously expensive, foreclosing other needs, or tragically short-sighted. A competence to speak convincingly to the morality of proposals and programs is desperately needed in this society, and, because of its inherited concern, I do not think the church can duck the necessity to develop the competence demanded, not only for it to be heard—but to be sought out.

Finally, the prophet has never been popular. People have seldom wanted to hear his message. And many prophets themselves perished. Their most conspicuous characteristic, after their unmistakable commitment, was courage. And to serve America as she needs to be served today, her churches will have to display a courage for which they are not at present conspicuously noted.

Christians and their Churches must always speak only out of love and compassion, but they must also be prepared to lose budgets, members, even jobs rather than compromise the witness. This is not how one would characterize today's Christian community, and it is therefore not surprising to find the Church so widely considered irrelevant, to find the young seeking other and self-centered kinds of religious experience, and to find Christians as Christians absent from the great councils of our time.

There is not much more to say on this subject. The times are grave. The call to the Church and to Christians has seldom been more urgent. I close with the words of Jesus which once were considered so important as to have been included in each of the four Gospels: "Whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it" (Mark 8:35, RSV).

Today these words are spoken rather less to the uncommitted, and rather more to you and me.

DISCIPLINE, MORALITY, RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP

T. H. Bell

I would like to use this significant gathering to talk

about discipline and moral values in education. I want to talk about them because I believe they are the keys to disciplined, responsible citizenship and because I fear that responsible citizenship is withering in our land.

I want to persuade you that all of us must raise our voice for a more disciplined society through more disciplined education.

By discipline in education I do not mean punishment, control, restraint. I mean commitment. I mean high standards and academic rigor. I mean sacrifice in the name of excellence.

We are drifting away from that kind of discipline in our schools, colleges, and universities. We must make new commitments to it—and not only in education. We must make new commitments to it in our life as citizens.

Discipline makes us productive, affluent, strong, enlightened, and free as a people. Take away discipline and you have decay, decline, anarchy, and abandonment of truth.

Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, asked: "Would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself?" I fear we have come almost to the point where we must answer *yes* to Jefferson's question. Academic test scores, voter registration figures—almost all the indexes we have—point to the kind of citizen lassitude Jefferson feared.

What are some of the signals we have received that discipline is sagging in our education system? Here are two:

- Testimony at a special hearing in Congress on the subject of violence and vandalism in the schools left an impression that many of our secondary schools are gripped by hopelessness and despair. Key witnesses implied that student assaults and violence could not be corrected—that school authorities could not cope with the situation.
- An article in a well-known publication recently reported that more than 40 percent of the graduating class of a reputable university had graduated with honors or *cum laude*. It implied that standards had slipped at this institution and that its academic rigor had declined.

And here are some of the warnings we have received that undisciplined education bears only the rotting fruit of undisciplined, apathetic citizenship:

- The overall voting record is lower in America than in most other democracies. Voters aged between 18 and 21 had the worst voting record of any age group in both 1972 and 1974.
- The Yankelovich Survey, financed by a number of foundations, found that in 1967 some 35 percent of Americans aged 16 to 25 considered patriotism an important value—but that six years later, in 1973, this had dropped to 19 percent.
- The National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education analyzed hundreds of handbooks on "Student Rights and Responsibilities" published by schools and state departments of education. More than 99 percent of them dealt with student *rights*. Fewer than one percent even mentioned *responsibilities*.

The Council of Chief State School Officers—state superintendents or commissioners of education, as they are variously known—concluded at their 1974 annual convention that "recognizing the need for a new level of citizenship education may be the most important action this council can take at this time."

I agree with the Council, and I have set up in the U.S. Office of Education a task force to make recommendations on citizenship education in the schools. The actual carrying out of any recommendations we may come up with will, of course, be left to state and local educators at their discretion. As Commissioner of Education I cannot impose any education plan on them. However, I feel that I have a responsibility to lead. I will exercise that responsibility.

I am glad to note that others share my concern and are taking active steps to nurture and encourage citizenship education and effective and responsible participation in civic affairs.

The American Bar Association, for example, supports a national clearinghouse on "Youth Education for Citizenship," and the National Endowment for the Humanities helped finance a program for the first twelve grades focusing on such concepts as participation, justice, and responsibility.

A National Task Force on Citizenship Education, supported by private foundations is examining new concepts and teaching methods for responsible citizenship. Its report, expected in June, will be available to educators and the general public.

I strongly suspect that much of the trouble we have in our schools these days is no more or less than a response to boredom. A more disciplined society would surely give our young people a more disciplined, demanding, and therefore a far more stimulating environment. There is more to learn than ever before in history. Our youth are more talented and able today than ever before.

I do not imply that education should disregard the problems that some learners have. If there is any place where discipline must be constantly mellowed by compassion, it is in our schools and colleges. We must always allow for individual differences. We must stand up for the rights of minorities. Equality of opportunity must begin with education if we are to apply this principle to all facets of living. We must have compensatory education for the disadvantaged. Those with learning problems need and deserve the extra effort and expense to meet their needs.

Teachers should be charitable and kind in applying rules and standards to students deserving of a break. I stand for that. But at the same time I wonder whether we are not spreading this kind of classroom charity over too many students who need and deserve more challenge.

I emphasize again that disciplined education does not need to be a mindless authoritarian system that drives more than it leads, punishes more than it persuades. But, without abandoning compassion and empathy, we can have a no-nonsense program that calls for mastery of reading, mathematics, spelling, and other basics. Too many students are getting by from one grade level to another without this mastery. We know vastly more than ever before about how to teach

the bottom 25 percent, and we should apply what we know.

Not all children will attain a high level of proficiency in reading and mathematics. But we can't live with the high percentage of students who in some large urban school systems fail to reach an acceptable level. We can do better.

A school system committed to disciplined standards of excellence in teaching and learning will take all measures possible to educate the bottom one fourth of the student body. A few systems have demonstrated this capacity. What we need is a nationwide resolve to reach a higher level of performance.

We must help our youth find happiness and fulfillment through serious work in an atmosphere of reasonable standards that are sensibly, firmly, and consistently applied. Today's young men and women need to learn that the closest helping hand is at the end of their own arm. We need a strong, new, vigorous commitment to the old-fashioned work ethic. Let's teach that ethic in our schools. It will be the finest lesson our youth will ever learn.

I speak fairly often to high school and college graduating classes. Sometimes I pose a set of questions and tell the graduates that if they can answer *yes* to all of them they can consider themselves to be educated persons. Three of my questions seem especially appropriate to mention at this particular seminar. Here they are:

First, have you developed a clear set of standards and ideals to guide your life and your daily living?

A truly educated person lives by some abiding principles that are important and personally satisfying. It is good to be open and teachable and to let one's standards grow with true conviction and conversion to new thoughts. It is quite another matter, however, to agree with everyone and to lack strength of conviction. A very wise man once said "He who trims himself to everybody will soon whittle himself away." Without being rigid, we all need a firm rooting in those basic ideals, political views, and principles that we hold to be genuine.

My second question: Have you educated your feelings, your spirit, and your inner soul? Have you learned to enjoy fine music, great art, good literature, and the sounds and sights of nature? A quality life calls for quality thoughts and feelings and an appreciation for the fine things around us. We can't consider ourself educated without these qualities.

The third question in my test of an educated person is: Do you know *yourself,* and can you apply what you know to maintain your physical and mental health . . . and can you control your appetites and passions?

It is of no avail to be an intellectual giant and a physical weakling! Most knowledgeable people know that exercise, proper nutrition, and adequate rest are essential to good health.

About mental health I ask: Do you live with reality? Are you positive in your thinking? Is your outlook uplifting and wholesome? Do you know how to be free and enjoy freedom?

Some people live as prisoners in a free land because they are slaves to their habits and to their fears and paranoiac outlook.

Those are three of the questions among several others that I ask graduating seniors. I have selected them because they all bear on self-discipline.

A well-disciplined life is the only road to true happiness. It begins with an objective, disciplined education system, and it ends with more productivity by the people as a whole and a richer life for them as individuals. Discipline means more freedom, not less. We comply with a few fundamental laws and with some basic principles so that we can enjoy freedom.

I turn now to the teaching of values and the matter of moral development in education.

Many educators believe that it is not the proper role of education to teach moral standards and values in our schools. According to this view, if we expose our youth to many concepts of behavior, each individual will arrive at those personal standards most acceptable to himself.

The next step in this line of reasoning is the idea that to impose standards of conduct, standards of dress, and standards of speech is in many ways coercive. This kind of thought goes on to conclude that there is not much room in a democratically managed institution for imposition of moral values or implied rules of conduct and behavior.

This view of morality and of personal human values leads us to what is called "relevant," or "responsive." We let the so-called "felt needs" and the demands of our students tell us how to run our schools. This in turn leads us to "openness" in education—open admissions, open classrooms, and open grading that leaves students free to simply elect a pass or fail grade rather than a "coercive" letter grade. We want students to feel free from "authoritarian" controls because such controls subvert a truly democratic society. This entire line of thought is at the heart of many of our problems in today's society.

I find this line of thinking nonsense, but many educators find it hard to oppose. If you teach morality and values, they ask, whose do you teach? They go on to conclude that if a school seeks out students' views and "perceived needs," it will help their motivation.

Concern for motivation is, of course, legitimate. It has led to some changes for the better in education. The problem is that it may be dominating our thinking about the entire education system.

Any benefits from the pursuit of responsiveness, permissiveness, and neutrality on values have not been very spectacular. We seem to have reached an all-time high point in truancy, disrespect, lack of commitment, and a host of other problems that will be with us until we abandon our moral and ethical neutrality.

We must assume much more responsibility for moral development. We should, of course, avoid teaching religious precepts as such, for that is the role of the home and the church. We should also be careful not to get into the arena of the institutionally doctrinaire.

Avoiding those pitfalls, our institutions of education nevertheless should unapologetically teach what we call the American way of life—the value and virtues of our system. Moral values, a code of conduct, ethical standards—all are clearly implied in the Bill of Rights and in the entire structure of our system. We don't have to be morally neutral about them.

The teacher should teach much more than subject matter. The ideals of our Nation as set forth in our

Constitution and statutes, and those universal verities of honesty, forthrightness, and unvarnished truthfulness must be reawakened in our classrooms.

Forcefully and without any equivocation, our schools should teach equality of opportunity, freedom from prejudice, honesty, respect for law. Our stand should be so strong, so clear, that we come across to our students as harboring no nonsense in this area.

We need not be ashamed to teach these great principles. Without them we will teach only half of what our students expect and deserve from us.

We have for a number of years been on a nationwide binge of permissiveness. Anything goes, we have been saying, because everything depends upon the individual choice, taste, and personal appetite.

But students don't want to be "liberated." They want to be challenged!

Education, if it is anything, must be committed to building self-confidence, ambition and ever-rising horizons in the mind and soul of the youth of our Nation. Our Founding Fathers saw this. I quote Thomas Jefferson again: "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

Since her earliest days America has faced and conquered many problems, but new ones never stopped coming up. Today we have many that sorely challenge both our technical ingenuity and our value system. Some, like unemployment, inflation, urban blight, and the energy shortage, are obvious. Others, not so obvious, are in every sense equally important and perhaps more far-reaching in consequence—one especially, and that is the dropout of many citizens from civic life that I have talked about. Self-government is on trial in America today.

Only education can break the civic withdrawal syndrome and reinstall in our everyday life the values that make for responsible citizenship. Our Nation's formal school structure must of course play a lead role in this resurrection. But we also must realize, as did the Founding Fathers, that education doesn't begin or end at the schoolhouse or college door.

Television and radio, newspapers, magazines, motion pictures—as well as our families, churches, and other institutions—are in every sense integral parts of this Nation's education team and must consider themselves full partners in this educational effort.

There are indications that the tide is turning back in the direction of more citizenship education and participation. I intend to support and encourage this to the fullest in the hope that it will become a full-fledged national movement.

NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY—A NATIONAL PRIORITY

Edward M. Kennedy

It is a great privilege for me to have the opportunity to speak to you concerning health care as a national priority. During the last six years, as I have worked for national health insurance, I've had many opportunities to speak with religious leaders from across the nation. I have always been impressed with the moral sensitivity I've heard expressed, and their energy for social justice. I am grateful for the work of men, like your own Welton Gaddy, who've testified before Congressional committees on health care. It is clear that many national issues that boil down to questions of justice and compassion, can be mightily affected by our churches.

My hope is that in the coming months, we can rid the health care debate of the reflex responses and polarized positions that have been its stock in trade for four decades. With the possible exception of gun control, there is no subject of national debate where responsible progress on a critical issue has been more confused and misinformed than the debate over health care in America.

Our nation has created the finest medical schools, the finest hospitals, and some of the best medical care and medical research in the world.

These are great achievements, but we still face enormous problems in getting good health care out from the medical schools and teaching hospitals and into the lives of all of our people.

Living in a rural community can make it difficult to get health care, so can living in the inner-city; so can being poor—or just living on a tight budget. And for forty million Americans, being unemployed or self-employed, working part-time, or working for a small company means they have no health insurance. And that can discourage you from getting the care you need.

Several years ago, I walked through a rural community in West Virginia where a physician pointed out the slightly twisted ankles, the lame arms, and the dull lethargy, especially in many children. He testified that in one way or another, they reflect health care never delivered, or delayed until too late. Children and their parents alike had debilitating diseases that result from lack of basic nutrition, sanitation, and hygiene. The parents simply didn't know better.

But, I don't have to tell you—you can conjure up the picture in your mind of a community too poor for the most part to own cars, miles from the doctor, afraid of the hospital, and too proud to ask for help they can't pay for, unless they're convinced it's a real emergency.

And it isn't limited to admittedly extreme rural cases like this one. I've talked to low-income parents in many rural and inner-city communities who wait to make sure their child is really "$15.00 sick" before they take him to the doctor. I've also talked to parents waiting for four to six hours in city emergency rooms to get medical attention.

In situations like this, where people are short of money, where it's hard to get to the doctor, where they must wait for hours, and where they face indignities along the way—people simply don't receive good health care.

And there are statistics that bear out these personal experiences:

—In the mid-1960's, 15 percent of the 18-year-old boys who volunteered for military duty in our na-

tion were rejected from the draft for medical conditions that might have been helped.

—One-third of the women whose babies are delivered in public hospitals in our country have had *no prenatal care at all.*

—The infant death rate for our minority children is nearly twice that of whites, and half again as many minority preschoolers die of infectious diseases such as influenza and pneumonia.

Nor is the problem limited to low-income or minority families. In a 1975 survey in New York City the National Academy of Sciences found that:

—One-fourth of all the younger children surveyed were anemic,

—Forty percent of the children who wear glasses could see better without them, and

—Eighteen to twenty percent had active middle ear infections.

And these findings held true *across income lines.* The fact is that we are not getting health care to all our people, and many of our children are facing unnecessary barriers to growing up, getting educated and becoming productive adults in our society.

Moreover, the health care we do provide is getting so prohibitively expensive that neither government, nor the private citizen can afford to pay the bill. Indeed, I believe we have reached the turning point in health care—the point where rising costs threaten to force us backwards from the social progress we've already made.

As a nation, we spent $17 billion on health care in 1955—that was $104 per person in the country. By 1965, this had more than doubled to $39 billion, or $198 per person. And by 1975, it more than doubled again to $118 billion, or nearly $550 for every man, woman and child in our nation; that includes insurance premiums, government programs and personal out-of-pocket expenditures. When you add it all up, we went from $104 per person to $550 per person in twenty years.

For the average family, this has meant rising doctor and hospital bills—a day in the hospital in the District of Columbia now costs over $200. It has also meant rising insurance premiums—Aetna Insurance Company projects average increases of 25 percent this year with some as high as 60 percent. And finally, it has meant rising state and federal taxes to pay for Medicaid and public hospital costs. In fiscal year '75, state and local health services expenditures rose $2.5 billion, or 20 percent, over fiscal year '74, or from $12.3 to $14.8 billion. Federal expenditures rose nearly $6.0 billion.

State and local governments everywhere are reacting to rising Medicaid costs by cutting benefits. My own Commonwealth of Massachusetts has implemented major cuts. Massachusetts, one of the most generous states in the country with the poor, has swept some twenty-five thousand admittedly poor people completely off the rolls of Medicaid. They will still get state welfare support—but no more medical care.

And the federal government is leading the way to even further cutbacks. The President's fiscal year '77 budget for Medicaid puts the states on notice that in the future the federal government will pay for only one-half of the rate of increase in Medicaid that it has accepted in years past. What that means—if the President's program passes—is more state cuts in coverage for the poor.

The President has also proposed changes in Medicare that cut back coverage of the elderly by nearly $3/4 billion. The elderly will have to pay the difference out of their own pockets.

From the viewpoint of the budget, there are too many elderly. There are too many poor. There are too many unemployed. Federal and state revenues are too far down because of the recession, and health care costs are too far up because of inflation. The poor and elderly are caught in the middle. They feel the squeeze first and they feel it most.

These cuts are doubly tragic. We are told the cuts are necessary to solve our economic problems. But the people who are hurt the most by the cuts are the same Americans who have already been hurt the most by inflation and unemployment. The poor, the disabled, the millions of Americans living on limited incomes—and their children—are being asked to pay the price of curing our economic ills.

I do not believe that we as a nation are so bankrupt in spirit that we must ask this of the elderly, the poor, and the weak in our society.

I do not believe that a retreat from our commitment to social justice is an honorable solution to the problem of rising costs of health. There has to be a better and wiser and fairer answer, if we are to earn the faith and respect of the millions of poor, elderly, and disabled citizens who cannot afford decent health care in this rich land.

But the cutbacks—and the loss of what we've worked hard to win—does not just affect those on government programs.

The same forces that are pushing up Medicare and Medicaid costs, are pushing up private insurance premiums and health care costs all over the country. We just initiated a 35 percent increase in the health insurance premiums for federal employees.

And I understand that Blue Cross and Blue Shield are proposing to General Motors that they cut back their employees' health insurance coverage as an alternative to another 35 percent premium increase.

General Motors now pays more to Blue Cross/Blue Shield each year than to United States Steel. Their health insurance costs $1,800 per year per employee or $175 for every new car produced.

And there is no end in sight. Leading health economists predict a continuation of inflation in health care costs into the foreseeable future. The Congressional Budget Office predicts that all personal health service expenditures in the country, including government, private insurance, and out-of-pocket payments, will more than double by 1981—rising to $238 billion. There is little or nothing in our health care system to put any lid on these incredibly escalating costs.

But common sense tells us there will be a lid, rational or not. For a time, those with adequate incomes may be able to keep the protection they need —perhaps at some sacrifice to their standard of living, but at no real risk to their health. But at some point, the average American family will be forced to deal with the irresistible pressures on their pocketbook. Labor unions and employers will be obliged to lower

health insurance premiums in order to obtain wage increases and millions of middle-income Americans will get *less* health insurance coverage for their families.

For several decades, insurance coverage has been steadily expanding for the average American family. I suggest that rising costs have brought us to the point where we may be moving in the other direction. And, as insurance gets *narrower,* even middle-income families will find they cannot afford care. And for more and more Americans, whether or not you get health care will depend on how much insurance you have and how much money you make.

Decent health care in our rich land should not depend on such things. It is a retreat from social justice that goes against all we hold dear in America.

We are people who place a high value on the individual—on personal opportunity to develop our abilities to the fullest—and on individual freedom. Nothng seems more tragic to us than lives filled with suffering, limited by disability, or lost too soon from illness or injury.

And if the disease or injury could have been prevented or corrected or cured—the tragedy is compounded. For a child to grow up with *needlessly* twisted limbs or a clouded mind offends our most basic sense of fairness and equity. For a family to be bound in poverty by needless illness or disability is a denial of what we cherish most for our people.

In a nation such as ours, I believe health care should be a "right." To the greatest practical extent, we should guarantee quality health care to all of our people by law.

In simple terms, health care should be viewed like education—as a need too basic to depend on a person's income.

If we are to reach this high goal, we must act to preserve the gains we've made in the past; to extend good insurance and decent care to all our people; and to control the skyrocketing costs that otherwise will put good health care beyond the reach of all of us.

And we can accomplish this through national health insurance.

—National health insurance can cover every American, regardless of where he works, where he lives, how much he makes, or any other factor;
—It can offer comprehensive coverage, including preventive care, and care in the doctor's office *as well as* in the hospital, and family; and
—It can reform our health care system to control costs, encourage efficiency, and assure that decent care is offered to everyone at a cost they can afford to pay.

I would argue, further, that the best national health insurance program for accomplishing these aims uses the Social Security system.

Social Security could cover a person from birth till death. It would always be with you. You would be covered from job to job. You'd be covered between jobs. You'd be covered when you're unemployed. You earn the coverage while you work, and it would always be there protecting you. There are no waiting periods, no exclusions or exemptions, no gaps in coverage, no sudden loss of coverage when you can least afford it, none of the other defects that are so familiar in private insurance policies today, and that make the present system such a nightmare for the people.

Moreover, Social Security would cover every American with the same program, and pay the same for everyone's health care. There would be no degrading double standard, but one Social Security system for all. Moreover, the system could cover the millions of Americans who have a history of medical problems—and who at present find it next to impossible to get insurance—even though they are the very ones who need it most.

Another great advantage of Social Security is that the amount of your contribution would be geared to income. Every family would pay a percentage of their income. Under my plan, the worker would pay one percent and his employer would pay three and one-half percent. This is a better way to pay for health insurance than requiring the same flat premium to a private insurance company from everyone—whether he earns $6,000 or $20,000. And it's better than requiring people to pay different premiums in different companies depending on how much of a medical risk their group is.

But in the face of rising costs, perhaps the greatest advantage of a Social Security approach is that it allows strict budgeting of health care and hospital expenditures, and allows more vigorous cost controls.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that in the short run all pending comprehensive national health insurance proposals would increase by only 8 percent the total amount spent nationally on health care. And in the space of five years, by 1981, they estimate a Social Security-funded bill, such as the one I've proposed, could actually save $21 billion per year over our present system by controlling rising costs.

True, we will have to make payments into Social Security in the form of additional taxes. I share the growing concern of many about our tax burden, which has mushroomed in recent years. But health care is not free. And the insurance premiums Americans pay right now are going up faster than taxes.

Personally, I believe the average American would be delighted to pay 8 percent more for comprehensive health insurance, both for his own sake in the long run and to protect the millions of others for whom health care remains not a "right," but a "privilege" they cannot afford.

The debate over health care in our nation has been long and difficult. It began before the passage of Medicare—and I believe it will continue as long as there is injustice—as long as dollars and cents get in the way of decent care for all. It is not a debate that we in good conscience can avoid and I urge you all to enter it.

As a nation, we can only be great and strong by showing compassion for those who are poor and weak, and by protecting one another in times of illness and adversity. If we retreat from compassion and mutual concern today, we will create a society short on concern and compassion tomorrow.

We must do better for our future—and we must do better for our present. We don't really want to live in a society that does not care for its own.

The lives we offer to the poor, the elderly and

the weak—and our children's lives and the richness of the future we offer them—may be the best test of our humanity. It is certainly the best test of our Christian citizenship.

We do not have to retreat in health care. We can do better than this. We have the resources and we have the know-how to guarantee health care to all our people as a matter of right. And because we *can*, I believe we *must*.

CONTINUING THE REVOLUTION

Harvey G. Cox, Jr.

I would like to make one point, and one point very emphatically, this evening under the topic of "Continuing the Revolution." It is my conviction that the American Revolution, which began *before* the war of independence and should not be confused with the war of independence, is not one that can ever be terminated and still be thought of as a successful revolution. Just as Martin Luther once contended that the church is only the church as it continues to reform itself, so a society which begins with the vision of revolution as our society did continues to be true to itself only as that revolution continues.

The most dangerous revolutions are the ones that are declared to be over, once and for all. We see that phenomenon in eastern European societies. "We have had our revolution," they say, and therefore any criticisms or any visions of fundamental change are ruled out. That is not the nature of the vision which inspired the birth of the American republic. Underlying the revolutionary vision of our earliest years there is a theological conviction. Therefore, it is important for Christians to understand what revolution is about and why the revolution of American society is one that must continue. So, the question is not *whether* it continues, but *how* it continues.

There are probably those of you here who, during your visit to Washington, will visit the Smithsonian Institute. When you do so, you will notice at the foot of one of the large cases of stairs a rather odd and, in fact, bizarre statue. The statue appears at first to be that of a Greek god, perhaps Zeus. It is an immense construction towering forty feet high—a seated figure, colossal, in stone, on a throne-like chair, an olive crown on his head, hand held in blessing, wearing Roman-style sandals, and a toga which bares part of the chest. Who is this imperial figure now stored in the Smithsonian Institute? None other than George Washington in a very unlikely pose! In fact, it is such an unlikely pose that my children could not really believe that was the George Washington they had heard about. My eleven-year-old daughter said, "Did George Washington ever wear a crown and sandals and a toga like that?" And I had to allow that probably he never did.

This statue was commissioned by Congress in the early part of the nineteenth century, executed by a then well-known (but happily now not so well-known) sculptor who decided to portray George Washington, the father of our country, after the classic Greek depictions of Zeus. The hand held in blessing, the blessing bestowed by the Roman emperor. This statue of Washington as Zeus depicts for me the difficulty Americans have always had in sorting out the faith of Americans in God (which leads both to our praying *for* and to differing *with* the nation of which we are a part) and of our constant temptation to move back toward an imperial cult. Our constant temptation, which is somewhere in our national subconscious, to move toward a cult always reminds me of the cry of the children of Israel: "All the other nations have a king and why can we not have a king, also?"

The statue itself has had a somewhat difficult and episodic history. It stood for a while on the Capitol grounds, was later moved to another location somewhat less public, and then finally, I suppose in the dark of night, was moved down into the basement of the Smithsonian—where it is still, just in case we ever need it again. I invite you to go to see it to remind yourself both of that temptation within the American soul to drift toward an imperial cultus and our unusually sensible way of getting through that kind of a crisis, a crisis not completely different from the one we are emerging from now. Once again, we have seen our national temptation to move toward an imperial form of government, rather than a democratic one, and toward an idolatrous attitude toward those in power.

No, the American Revolution is not over. The American Revolution must continue because it is a revolution in the first instance against tyranny and against privilege. It is a revolution which believes in returning power to the hands of the people and requires the people thoughtfully to discuss, to consider, and to take action. Revolutions against tyranny and privilege are never over. Revolutions are never over because, as Christians we believe that until the coming of God's final judgment, there is always that sinful temptation in the human heart to slip back through sloth or fear or cynicism toward the easier path, the path of delegating decisions and delegating authority, giving up power and allowing others to make choices for us. So, the Revolution is never over. When we declare it is over, then we are in the greatest of all difficulties.

I think, however, that to continue the American Revolution does require a theological vision. Without that theological grounding, revolutions tend to declare themselves over at a certain stage, when those who have been out of power are in power and decide that no one else will ever share that power with them. A profound view of human nature implicitly and sometimes explicitly underlies the founding documents and the early thought that motivated the American Revolution. This theological vision mixes confidence in the capacity of ordinary human beings to make decisions for themselves, since they are, in fact, created by God and have the gift of reason and the capacity for choice, but also sees that sin lives in the human heart. The tendency to grasp for privilege and power remains there also, and must constantly be dealt with.

I think we need an independent, vigorous, and critical church in American society continually calling us back to this vision, calling us back not just to Lexington and Concord (which we in New England think is ultimate, somehow), but calling us back beyond that, in fact, to Sinai and to Galilee. Without that grounding, what happened at Lexington and Concord becomes just one more chapter in a dead revolution.

The problem, however, is this: What began with a faith that God had something in store for the people of America quickly became in the early nineteenth century a faith in America itself. The faith *of* Americans somehow became transmuted into a faith *about* America. I remind you this evening always to be very, very suspicious when any politician talks about faith without any object of that faith.

One of the most dangerous ploys in American political life today is to say, "We need more faith." Faith in what? Christians are not in favor of faith in general, or faith as it is attached to *any* object that happens to come along. The major opponent of the biblical prophets and of Jesus was not *unfaith*, but faith in unworthy objects—faith in the nation, faith in the emperor, faith in anything which is less than God. Yet somehow, we have witnessed over the years a tendency, checked here and there, called here and there, to move away from our faith in God as the only legitimate object of human faith, the God who is revealed for us in Jesus Christ, to faith in other and lesser objects.

Compare, for example, these two familiar stanzas, the last lines of a favorite Christmas carol, "O Little Town of Bethlehem":

> The hopes and fears of all the years
> Are met in Thee tonight.

How quickly that became, in the words of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, another poem that most of us know:

> Sail on, O Ship of state.
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great;
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all the hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

How quickly our confidence, our hopes, our fears centered in that event in Bethlehem, in which God revealed himself, somehow moved toward something less worthy of that kind of ultimate concern and faith.

I think we will not be able to make the contribution we have to make, the sustaining, and yet at the same time critical, contribution to the continuation of the American Revolution, unless we sort out the difference between biblical faith and American civil religion.

American civil religion has its own creed which is *not* the creed of the churches. It has its own heroes, its own prophets, its own saints, which are different from those we honor and respect. There is no reason why Americans should not be loyal to our own nation. But our nation is simply not an appropriate object for us as Christians. We do not believe that the American nation has been singled out among all nations of the world for some specially privileged relationship with God. We simply cannot believe that and still hold to Christian faith which insists that God calls to himself a people from all nations and colors and creeds and that their relationship to each other is not that of national citizenship, but of having been born of the Spirit. We cannot believe that God has some kind of special manifest destiny for this people, above and beyond other peoples. Nor can we believe that we have some kind of special innocence not shared by the other peoples of the globe.

This, then, is what we must continue to remind ourselves, our neighbors, and our leaders as we celebrate and come close to interring the American Revolution. If not continued, the American Revolution is a failure. It is not the kind of revolution which can be successfully concluded within history, given what we believe as Christians about the nature of man and the nature of human societies. Jefferson once wrote that he believed every nation should have a revolution every two or three generations to prevent power from being centralized. What the founding fathers tried to do was to institutionalize in popular elections, and in the division of powers, and in several other ways, a continuation of the revolutionary practice—the returning of power to the people so the people could make their own decisions. Part of this was a self-consciously and explicitly expressed self-limitation on the powers of government. All of these are things that we constantly have to remind ourselves and our people of, especially in a Bicentennial year.

I think at this stage and this particular year, in order to celebrate the Bicentennial with maturity as Christians, we are required to say both a yes and a no. To the assumptions which lead to the founding of the American republic, the theological assumptions and the political ones based on them, and to what happened in the continuing course of American history to bring us to 1976, I believe we are required to say a yes and a no. As a Christian I cannot join those who say an "unqualified" yes to all that it meant then and to all that it has come to mean until now. However, I cannot be quite the abdicating cynic, having nothing to do with the celebration of our nation's 200th anniversary. I am an American. I am a part of this society. I want to celebrate! But somehow, I want to celebrate it like I celebrated my last birthday (which was my forty-sixth). I'm not entirely happy about the way everything has gone. I'm happy that I've made it this far. I hope I will get a little further. But I'm ready, at this point—perhaps as a late bloomer, with a certain kind of maturation—to look back and say yes and no to certain aspects of my life. We probably all feel that way about the Bicentennial. We are a little embarrassed by it, yet not quite able to resist a certain amount of nostalgia, and are able, in fact, to shed some tears.

What, then, do we say yes to and what do we say no to as Christians, if we are committed to a revolution which is not over, which by its very nature must continue if it is to express those theological premises of biblical insights, which are undoubtedly there in the thinking and writing of the founding fathers?

I want to mention two things to which, I think, we now must say no. We don't say no cynically or nastily, but we say no because we have moved another 200 years since then. As Pastor John Robinson said as the pilgrims sailed, "God does have new light to bring forth from his holy Word." Later, I want to mention two things to which we ought to say yes, and yes very emphatically.

First, where do we say no? We say no, I think, to the notion that I referred to earlier, to the idea that the American nation has a special, unique relationship to God's providence and grace which gives us special privileges, *vis-a-vis* the other nations of the world. We can believe or accept this on a careful reading of the Bible. God did not choose the American nation. God chose Israel, the Israelites. But God has chosen a people to supplement his first chosen people, but not to exclude the Israelites. He chose a new people out of all the nations and tongues of the world and they are the

instrument through which he chooses to make his will known, to make his Word heard, and to make his love manifest! Whenever we confuse this called people, this elect nation, of which by grace most of us hope we are a part, with any nation, state, empire, or race, then we are in deep trouble—idolatry and, in fact, heresy.

Now admittedly, the American nation is not the only one that has committed this sin of national idolatry. All around the world there are peoples who, in one way or another, believe themselves to be the central vehicles for history's purpose. There is Holy Mother Russia. There is China which still thinks of itself as the great central kingdom. There is France which still sometimes acts as though it were divinely commissioned to bring civilization to all the world. There is the "sun never setting on the British Empire," and on and on and on. Perhaps it is time now to blow the whistle as Christians on the notion that any empire or nation has this status in God's providence and to begin looking for evidences of God's people across those kinds of boundaries, to celebrate and affirm and welcome them and to feel at one with them regardless of where they come from, what language they speak, what color they are, or what their cultural backgrounds are.

The second thing to which we have to say no is our founding fathers' limited sense of who is created equal after all. They put it rather explicitly: "We hold these truths to be self-evident," they wrote, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights and that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." Now unfortunately, they were all too explicit on one of those points. They said "all men," and I'm afraid they really meant all *men!* They did not mean women. And if you think they did mean women, notice who was allowed to vote until more recent days. They probably did not mean ordinary people, who didn't hold property. They certainly did not mean slaves; nor did they mean native Americans. They meant *certain* men. Certain men are created equal and are endowed with these inalienable rights.

It's probably a little cheap to cast them aside, 200 years later, for their limitation of vision. Theirs in itself, was a significant step. However, I think we have to take them at their word. But somehow, we must make that little word *men* include many, many, many more people than their limited vision did.

What would it mean during the next century of American history if everyone affirmed that all people are created equal and, therefore, have equal rights of access to that which provides and sustains life? What would it mean for America as the grainery of the world to accept the fact that even small, hungry children in Behar State or in sub-Sahara in Africa, in fact, do have a God-given right to life? Life includes the right to food and health care, not as the recipients of a magnanimous act of charity on the part of the rich. It is a God-given right! What does that mean?

I think we have to say no to the limitations on that phrase in the founding documents, but an emphatic yes to its underlying thrust. In God's vision, all people are, in fact, created—if not with equal abilities, interests —with equal rights to that which sustains life and liberty, and that includes food and shelter.

I think we have to say yes also—a thankful, grateful yes—especially to two items in the theological agenda of the founding fathers. I am going to say this even though it is repeated so often that it sometimes sounds like a cliché. The phrase, "They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights," is one we should fight for to the last tooth and toenail. These people were insisting that these unalienable rights are not rights which are bestowed by governments, or by states, or by any other human agency, and therefore, they are not rights which can be taken away by governments, or states, or human agencies. Every human being possesses these unalienable rights because he or she is created by God. How can we possibly say this so it does not sound like a cliché? How can we say it in such a way that we really believe that no government has the right to take away from us or from anyone else the rights which God has given us? Can we also say that this includes the right to life, not only for minority groups (which we are just beginning to recognize and affirm, albeit very slowly), but also for those who are deemed not quite as intelligent as the rest of us, not quite as able to cope with the complexities and the demands of an industrial society, perhaps because their IQ's are not quite high enough to get them into Harvard.

We are faced, in the next few years and perhaps longer, by an assault on the notion of the equal rights of all human beings in our society. This assault is abetted by some very elaborate and sophisticated psychological and scientific theories—theories of genetic determinism, theories of race-linked characteristics, political theories which suggest that we have gone far enough now with affirmative action. As Christians, we have to continue to insist, not just because it is in the Declaration of Independence, or not because they are grounded in the Bill of Rights, or listed in some kind of Gallup poll, that the right of life and liberty and to the pursuit of happiness, whatever that might mean, is there because of the Creator, because of God.

Now, the second point that we should say yes to (and with this I will conclude) is in some ways one of the most theologically profound ideas that the founding fathers had, although they expressed it in a less explicit way. That is the whole belief that one can start again, that an individual can start again, that a whole society can begin again, the possibility of a new birth, of starting over, the notion that somehow or another a person or a society is not completely tied to what has happened in the past. We are not prisoners of history since there is something called grace. There is the possibility to sever the ties which bind and to begin again.

Three generations after the war of independence, Abraham Lincoln put it even more explicitly when he talked about a "new birth of liberty," drawing on a very old and very central biblical concept which Jesus himself articulates in the third chapter of John. Not only is new birth possible, but new birth is essential and indispensable.

This is an enormously important thing for us as Christians to emphasize precisely because I sense in America today a mood of fatalism—"there's not much you can do about it." There's a kind of retreat from engagement or interest in social issues, the continuing challenges of hunger, racism, and war—a kind of cynical detachment, a kind of defeatism. Yet against this, we have the conviction that a new start is always possible. In fact, Jesus himself in his preaching linked forgive-

ness of sins with readiness for the new kingdom which was coming. One is prepared for the coming of that future time, that new era because of the power of God, which breaks the link of sin, death, bondage, and captivity, and all those things which keep us trapped in past ways of doing things. Let us not minimize that notion which was there in the founding documents that a new birth, a new beginning was possible. Even after 200 years, we do not have to play the same scenario over and over again. It is possible to start again.

At one point in his ministry, someone brought to Jesus a coin and asked him the question of whether one should pay tribute to Caesar. We know from our biblical studies that this was really a trick question. The people posing the question were not really seeking information at all; they were trying to catch him, trying to trick Jesus into an answer which would alienate one or another of the ruling groups. Jesus asked for the coin and, when given it, looked at it, and pointed out the image of Caesar. Then he simply said that one should render to Caesar those things which are legitimately Caesar's and to God those things which are God's. I personally am very glad that Jesus did not answer the question finally and for all time. What he did was to give us the *form* in which *we* have to ask the question. In every generation, we have to ask the question: "What are those things which are legitimately Caesar's, the state's, the nation's? And what are those things which are legitimately God's?" And, even more tryingly, "What are those things that are legitimately God's which are being usurped illegitimately by the state and by the nation?" We need each other; we need each other's wisdom and advice and nurture and criticism to sort out that question not answered by Jesus. The question is posed for us.

I have often thought that if Jesus came to America today and was asked the same question, he might have a much harder time using that illustration than he did in the first century. Because if someone handed him one of our coins today, it would have on it both "In God We Trust" and the United States of America. In some ways that is a strength and in some ways that is the great weakness and peril of our nation's history—acknowledging the presence and judgment of God, but often confusing that presence with our own national destiny.

The question then, brothers and sisters, is not *if* the revolution will continue, or *whether* it will continue, but *how* it should continue. I invite you to be a part of that continuing revolution. I invite you to be a part of it mainly by remembering that the gospel is the most essential ingredient, the most essential ingredient for making sure the Revolution continues and does not die.

WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

George McGovern

In this Bicentennial season in the life of our country, we celebrate not simply the date of the nation's beginning, but if the Bicentennial is to mean to us what it should mean, then it must be a time when we are examining thoughtfully the very grounds of our national being. The defining feature of America is not the geographic place that we inhabit or the power that we are able to muster in a physical sense, but rather, it seems to me, the need to be pondering in 1976 is the validity of the principles which our forebears claimed were self-evident some two centuries ago.

We who call ourselves Americans have always recognized that we sprang from very diverse backgrounds, different traditions, different cultures, different convictions and our roots can be traced to every part of the world. We are literally the descendants of what Emma Goldman referred to as "the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free." What made a diverse collection of immigrants a unified nation was a set of ideas and principles that developed in a unique manner on this continent. At first this was referred to as a new world because it was, indeed, a newly discovered piece of geography, but the Revolution of 1776 which we commemorate this year made it a new world of the human spirit as well as a new place of geographic discovery. Yet, what was described as new some two centuries ago was, indeed, as old as the biblical prophets. I think it can be clearly demonstrated that the words of the American Revolution descend on a direct line from the Judeo-Christian morality.

The declarers of independence stated the proposition that all men are created equal, and that assertion had its origins in many phases and passages of the Bible: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. 25:40). And the bell which rang out the news of independence, which millions of Americans will visit Philadelphia before the end of this year to see, was inscribed with a passage from Leviticus (25:10): "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." The Declaration itself ended with these words, "a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence," and the chief architect of that Declaration said that he had sworn upon the altar of God "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." You will see those words inscribed around the circular monument to Thomas Jefferson in Washington, D.C.

This foundation, in a higher order of course, does not mean that America can arrogantly claim to be an ordained nation but that we must humbly seek to become worthy of this founding faith. We will not succeed fully, and no one should pretend to; no earthly endeavor ever will and we know that the kingdom of God in any fundamental sense is not going to spring alone from government policy or from any political process. But we also know certain fundamental, ethical obligations that have their counterpart in the world of public policy. We know that if someone is hungry, we have an obligation to feed them; if thirsty; an obligation to give them drink; if homeless, an obligation to provide shelter; and if suffering from illness, we have some obligation to provide a ministry of healing that is commensurate with what we are able to do in a world of modern science and government that represents the concerns of the governed. We also know that the practice of brotherhood must transcend every boundary of race, of age, of sex, and even of nationhood itself.

Yet, it seems to me that during recent years and elec-

tions, there has been a tendency to scorn those who apply moral principles in a serious way to public issues. Certain critics take delight in condemning moralizing, as they refer to it, when it is applied to the field of politics. I shall never forget the final pre-election edition of one of our leading news weeklies that chose to concentrate its greatest scorn on what it described as the hallmark of my presidential effort by its phrase, "the politics of righteousness."

But with all due deference to the politics of hard-boiled cynicism and the crass manipulation, which, I think it is fair to say, marked too much of the dialogue in 1972, I still believe that righteousness exalts a nation and I think the stain of Watergate and the blot of Vietnam on the recent history of this country underscores the hazard and the pitfalls of divorcing morality from public policy and diplomacy.

The folly of Vietnam was not the fact, as some critics have said, that we waged war badly and ineffectively. The folly was that it was a bad war to begin with. It is not a meaningful analysis to say that the computers at the Pentagon broke down. They, in fact, did their work well. It is not a truth in any sense of the word to say that we were not able to harness an adequate firepower to do the mission to which we had assigned our forces. What was not missing was the billions of dollars and the waves of bombers. Dr. Hollis has made it clear that I have had some experience with aerial bombardment. I had the privilege last January of visiting both North and South Vietnam with my wife, Eleanor, and we had an opportunity to fly in a plane from Hanoi to Saigon at a level, and where it was level, to observe the countryside all the way on a very clear, sunshiny day. It was enough to sicken the heart of any concerned person to see those tens of thousands of bomb craters that have torn up the jungle and the villages and the countryside in that bleeding little country. More bombs were dropped on that tiny little strip of Asian jungle than were dropped on the entire world in the second World War. So, it was not the absence of firepower there. What was missing was a basic moral balancing of ends and means; so it was that people were killed in order to save them. The saving of face was justified even though it involved the sacrificing of lives. Our leaders asked from time to time how much the war cost in dollars. They asked what the body count was on a daily basis. They asked the planners of the war how long it would take. In short, they asked everything about how the job could be done but the most important question of all—the question of whether it was right in terms of the ideals and the principles and the ordinary decency that characterizes this country when it lives up to the ideals that it professes. That is also the one question that, from all indications, was not asked at any time inside the White House by those who planned and executed this whole web of activities now known as Watergate.

I think we have paid doubly for the omission of principle from public decisions. We have paid on the first ground in that the decisions were morally wrong and we have paid in the second instance in that they haven't worked very well politically in terms of the nation's condition.

The recognition, though, of that central truth of the double danger of separating morality from public decisions can actually provide some degree of hope for a better future for this nation. If we heed the ancient promise that comes to us in these words: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land" (2 Chron. 7:14). We have the echo of that promise worded somewhat differently in that pledge on the first Fourth of July in the nation's being when we read this phrase: "these Free and Independent (United) States" shall "appeal . . . to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions."

So let us commemorate the beginning of America by reconfirming the moral underpinning that was so familiar to Jefferson and his colleagues in those early years. Let us resound the inner music of the Liberty Bell, the deeper tones of its meanings to be heard in our national conscience. Let us resolve to keep the Pledge of Allegiance, not simply to a flag or to a symbol, as important as they may be, but to the values for which those symbols stand. The phrase that I address tonight, "With Liberty and Justice for All"—not liberty and justice for all *but,* or all *if,* or all *maybe,* but for all Americans, the minority who are not white and the majority who are women, for all among us who are still tired or poor or huddled or yearning to breathe free—includes more millions of our fellow citizens than we are sometimes willing to recognize.

We will move closer to that liberty and justice only by practical measures; this time, a practicality not to frustrate but to fulfil ethical responsibility. For example, we started the American Revolution with a cry of "no taxation without representation." I think I made the observation last year that if Patrick Henry felt that taxation without representation was bad, he ought to take a look at what taxation is like *with* representation. We laugh about that because we know it has a serious thought. We do have a tax structure that gradually over the years has been so doctored by loopholes and special interest concessions that it no longer represents justice for all the American people. No worker in a system of just taxation should be required to pay a higher percentage of his or her income than is paid by a wealthy investor who lives by means other than physical labor. This does not mean the division of society into class against class as was charged a few years ago when we proposed fundamental tax reform. It means the only possible basis under which we can restore unity and confidence in the tax structure that finances the programs of this free society. And here, as elsewhere, not only justice but the confidence that justice is being done is the precondition of a free society. Liberty is not free of cost, either in the winning of it or in the keeping and completion of it. In order to liberate millions of families in this land from a forced neglect of illness and unaffordable costs of treatment, we must develop a just tax structure in order to guarantee in some cases a decent public service employment for those people. Nothing is more wasteful or destructive of human dignity than forced idleness that stems from the inability of our society to provide useful work opportunities for our people.

The needs of justice and liberty must not be sacrificed for other goals and that's what this battle over national priorities is all about. We need to understand that when we make a decision, for example, to approve

a new fleet of B-1 bombers at a time when we already have the capacity to pulverize the world forty or fifty times over, it is not only the overkill and the addition to the arms race that we need to worry about, but as President Eisenhower warned some fifteen years ago, it is the fact that that takes away from those who are hungry, or those who are homeless, or from the cleanliness and safety of the neighborhoods in which we live.

So, as we seek to enrich the meaning of our liberty, we must prevent the erosion of those values which were secured for us so many years ago. In the end, I think both liberty and justice in this society will be secured as they were at the start by the votes and by the vigilance of the citizens of this land. Government is not going to be any better, and often it will be as bad as we are willing to accept. These are days when it is very popular in politics to run against the government, talk about the sins of Washington, the evils of the federal government. I sometimes wonder when I listen to some of these candidates decrying the evils of Washington why they want to go there. But I know that in the last analysis the people who work for the United States government, from the lowliest bureaucrat up to the President of the United States, tend more often than not to reflect the moral and social level and the concern of our people as a whole. So, by our votes and by our vigilance, we hold the principles of this nation. And that is the truth which makes us free.

Let me just say that there are still certain self-evident principles which I think have been brought home to us in this country in a very forceful way through the events of the last few years. The first is the necessity of speaking the truth, of understanding that in a democracy in no campaign, and especially in a campaign for the presidency, can we tolerate deceptive dialogue; that no foreign policy, especially the waging of war, can excuse the telling of lies to the American people. The government is supposed to listen to the American people, not listen in on them. The seat of authority in our government must be more than a den of clever public relations manipulators. Those, above all, who represent the law in public must never be guilty of breaking the law, even in secret. Nor can a society based on liberty and justice permit us to distrust each other's patriotism, to scorn each other because of the diversity of our color, or our convictions, or even our age, accent, dress, or the style of our music. Especially in this Bicentennial presidential election year, we must resist what is going to be a very strong temptation to feed on division and fear and uncertainty, because the rights of Americans are a part of a seamless web. The strand of dignity that is trampled on by blocking a schoolhouse door, or overturning a school bus, is the same invisible strand that protects the safety of our homes or the locks of the doors at Watergate. We do not always like the decisions of the courts of our land and it is our privilege to say so, but if justice in this country becomes subordinate to our personal convenience, then no one of us can be secure in our liberty.

I think the politics of cynicism and manipulation is always going to be weighted against liberty and justice. The light of liberty and justice must not only reach across our own homeland, but within the limits of our capacity and our proper role in the world, we must lift the same light to peoples elsewhere around the globe.

What seems to me to be important to remember as we look out on the world around us is that our own version of liberty and justice is not something that we can impose on the liking of others. They will have their own vision of how they wish to develop and achieve nationhood, and they may choose a vision of the future that is somewhat different from others—that is our right, that is their right, and it is not our responsibility. But these are the points that I would stress with reference to our outreach to the world around us. America must no longer be known as the world's chief supplier of arms, as a gunrunner to dictators who trample on the principles of liberty and justice that we honor here at home.

It disturbs me that after all of the revelations which Senator Church and others have brought to bear on the misbehavior of our intelligence agencies abroad that the highest officials in our government seem more disturbed about the fact that certain secrets have leaked out into public domain than they are about the shocking conduct that led to these investigations in the first place. I would hope that beyond this, as we look out on this world of differences and of vast and varying cultures around us, that we would remember the insightful phrase of the late President Kennedy who said that it is our function not to remake the world in our image but to try to make this world safe for diversity, a world where we understand that as long as human beings are human, there will be differences among us. It is very popular in some quarters to assail the concept of détente between the Soviet Union and the United States or between China and the United States. Sometimes I think we made a mistake in using that foreign word. We should have called it "peaceful coexistence," as President Eisenhower referred to it. It really means about the same thing. Those who assail the spirit of détente or coexistence leave us with the question of whether they are suggesting the alternative of mutual annihilation. I think that is the alternative. So, recognizing the understandable differences that exist between our various countries, I hope that we would understand that we have a very basic national interest in building upon the spirit of détente between ourselves and these major powers—Moscow and Peking —no matter what the differences might be between those two countries, or the other differences that separate us.

The hazard, for example, the possibility of Armageddon, in order to sustain a particular faction that is at war in Angola, seems to me to be sheer madness, and I defy anyone in this room to give us a compelling description of the reasons why the United States should have stood up even to the point of destroying détente for any one of these three or four quarreling factions that were struggling to come to power in Angola, a country that we know even less about than we did about Vietnam when we last tried to set the world aright.

But beyond these factors of our survival—and I think they ought to be central in American foreign policy—are the quiet and usually silent needs of that other half of the planet who are ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. These, too, cry out for the attention and the intelligent response of the American people.

We have in the United States approximately five and one-half percent of the world's population, but we hold a little more than thirty percent of all the world's wealth. Yet, we now contribute, in the last fiscal year, less than one quarter of one percent of our Gross National Product to the development of this vast part of the globe that we refer to as the Third World. I think we must begin reducing this eight to ten billion dollar foreign aid budget that centers largely on military support systems that destroy and begin concentrating our best efforts on the technical and economic and humanitarian aid that can reach the problems of undisciplined population growth, the need for more food production, the need for more energy and those things that can raise standards of life in the developing parts of the globe.

On this same trip I made to Vietnam in January, I had the privilege of stopping briefly to visit some of the villages in Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh, as well as some of the urban areas in those countries. When one does that he sees again the incredible gap that separates us from them. I think here again moral evils raise material dangers. I don't believe that the world can permanently continue partly in prosperity but mostly in poverty. The cost of that injustice, sooner or later, will be more terror and less hope for peace and stability around us. This deprivation of their liberty to live threatens our own hope for peace and justice. The works of liberty and justice that I have referred to here tonight are the task of not a single year or even a single decade, and yet the possibility of doing them and the probability that we will survive this century will largely be determined by the decisions that we make in these current years. These decisions must be taken not in the dispirit of the recent past but in the spirit that has moved this nation in the best moments of our history.

Let us say with Isaiah (61:1): "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." I think that profession of faith in a higher order presents a call to work now in this world. The condition of these days provides the work that must be done. So let us then "proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." And, if we truly act on that admonition, then I think we will be able to pledge ourselves with new meaning to "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

ELECTIONS '76: A DEMOCRATIC PERSPECTIVE

Barbara Jordan

I suppose you invited me here to talk about the '76 elections from a Democratic perspective because you know I am not a candidate. There on the Hill we either have people who are running for President or people who would like to be President and they fall into these two camps. Over the weekend, you saw that there was a member of the House who turned down an offer to run for President and that was, in case some of you are a little puzzled, the National Black Political Assembly which met in Cincinnati and nominated Ron Dellams by acclamation. Acclamation—Udall would love that! But Ron decided that he did not feel he could justifiably run as an independent third party candidate and also for reelection to Congress as a Democrat. I'll just give you that because I recognized that I was saying something and nobody knew what I was talking about.

The Presidential primaries have been just a little bit confusing to many people. But if I have any message to you, it is: Don't be confused. The result is going to be very simple and uncomplicated. The Democrats will have an orgy in New York. We're going to have a Convention there, and it probably will always appear to have the confusions and complexities which surround national conventions, but the end result is that a person will be nominated President of the United States. One will be nominated Vice President of the United States and then we will go into the fall campaigns and the conflict and confrontation with politics with the Democratic nominee and the Republican nominee opposing each other and only one will win—simple, simple results. And I think a Democrat will win. You will probably hear some who will differ with that judgment or that "judgament" but I happen to think that we are not going to have four more years of — — — —. I don't think we're going to do that. I'll tell you why. People have very short attention spans. And the Republican party is depending on all of us having such short attention spans that we will forget all that happened to us in 1973 and 1974, that we will forget that but for what occurred in the Oval Office, instead of a former President of the United States being received as a chief of state in China, he might have had on striped overalls. He might have; we don't know. We don't know what the outcome might have been of the full development of trial or impeachment or if the courts had had an opportunity to pursue the administration of justice. People are not going to forget that somehow the will of the people was thwarted. It was first thwarted when Mr. Nixon resigned because some of us would have preferred to have seen a full development of the facts, the case, trial in the Senate, judgment in the Senate, and that would have finally concluded that matter. But we don't have that. The people are not going to forget that.

The people are also not going to forget how unsettled they have begun to feel about the Presidency or the reasons for feeling so unsettled. The reason that the bloom is off the Presidential rose is that certain aberrations occurred, were perpetrated by a sitting President. People are not going to forget that. If the people have difficulty remembering, I think there will be some Democrats ready to remind the people.

Now we're not going to fight Watergate all over. We're not going to have additional inquiries into abuses of power. We are not even going to mention the fact that in a deposition which Mr. Nixon recently filed, he regarded himself as a sovereign who could violate the law from time to time. And we're not going to remind people that in this country no one person is sovereign, that only the people are sovereign. Popular sovereignty is the frontispiece of the republic. But we're not going to remind people of that.

I think when people start to think seriously about this whole question that they will remember without any prodding. There is no reason, as I said, to become confused by the complicated processes of the Presidential primaries. I say complicated because winning becomes losing and losing becomes winning. A candidate receives forty percent of the votes in one place and is regarded a winner; he receives sixty percent of the votes in another place and is regarded a loser. And so it becomes a bit confusing. Focus on the results, the results of the general election, the result being to elect a President of the United States who can somehow bind up the wounds, heal the divisiveness in the nation and move us along a progressive route of achievement, the result that there is a President of the United States who will be elected that the people can trust. We may even have an event that we didn't know we'd have any more. We might elect a Christian as President. And we'll be all the better for it, in my judgment. But I'm not here to sermonize right now.

Some of the politicians dropped out and you can call the roll of those: Bayh, Shriver yesterday. I don't know whether you heard Mr. Shiver's withdrawal statement, but he said that the primaries only generated pablum in terms of rhetoric and pap for the ego and it's the pap and pablum that disgusted him and there was no substance to what was being said.

Friends, there won't be any substance to what is being said and you are going to have to trust the person who is elected President of the United States to develop substance after he gets elected, if he doesn't already have it, to put forth concrete programs, ideas, to develop solutions to problems, but a political campaign is not the time that that's going to happen. So we're going to have an overdose of what Shriver calls pap and pablum. But that is the stuff of politics. I feel I can say that because I regard myself as a politician and I regard myself as a successful politician and the only way you can tell a successful politician from an unsuccessful one is that a successful one gets elected.

We created a Federal Elections Commission as the result of the 1972 campaign tactics of Mr. Nixon and even that has become a very confused morass. The Supreme Court recently held that the method of appointment of the members of the Federal Elections Commission was unconstitutional and they gave the Congress a deadline for coming up with a constitutional Commission. That deadline passed. We went into court, asked for an extension. The Supreme Court granted an extension until March 22, yesterday. Yesterday came and went and we still have not reconstituted a constitutional Federal Elections Commission. At midnight last night, the Commission lost its power to distribute money to Presidential candidates and I think that the leadership of the House and the Senate will feel the heat of the candidates down the nape of their necks and the center of their backs and before the week is out, we probably will have reconstituted that Commission.

It is going to become more complicated as we move through the process of rules changes which are responsible for some of the primary complexities which you are now seeing. It was an effort on the part of us, the Democrats, to so reform the rule and broaden the base of participation that many of these primaries have yielded sometimes conflicting results. What difference does it make what the result is? I say, forget about process. That's not the important thing. Focus on results, that either a Democrat will win or a Democrat will lose. In all probability, the Congress will remain majority Democrat. So what difference does it make?

I think it makes a lot of difference. Are we going to have for another four years "flip-flop" judgments? Now think about what I am saying: Flip-flop judgments. I'm not just being critical of the judgments which are made by the President of the United States because he is a Republican. That's his prerogative. Whether I think it's misguided is beside the point. What do I mean by flip-flop judgment? The President on more than one occasion has said he was first for something and then quickly against it. The most recent example was last week in the antitrust bill which was considered by the House of Representatives and passed by the House. The effect of that bill would be to allow state attorney generals to sue on behalf of consumers for money damages as the result of violations of antitrust laws. The President had assured us a year ago that he was for it, that he supported it, and that he hoped it would be enacted. His administrator appeared before us and said that. Two days before the bill was considered on the floor of the House, the President sent a letter to the Minority Leader of the House saying, "Oops, I was wrong. It's really not a good bill and I hope you don't pass it." Flip-flop judgment!

Common Situs Picketing. Whether you are for it or against it, the President hired a Secretary of Labor and said, "You work on a Common Situs Picketing bill which will pass the Congress and I will sign it." And Mr. Dunlap worked with all of the labor unions and the others and came up with a bill. Congress passed it and the President said, (flip-flop again) "I'm vetoing that bill."

The President said he wanted the House of Representatives and the Senate to give him a specified judgment on energy matters and then withheld it after the President got what he wanted until the bill could be redrafted to suit some purpose that he had. Flip-flop judgment!

Does it make a difference? Maybe you will say to me that Democrats are also flip-floppers. Well, maybe we are, but we haven't seen any evidence of it and I can't document flip-flop judgments by Lyndon Johnson, John Kennedy and others who when they said they took a certain course of action, that that was their course of action.

Why does it make a difference? Surprise a month! That's the way I characterize it. It depends on to whom the President speaks as to what the foreign policy is at any given moment. We have expunged from the English language the word détente because it somehow did not suit political purposes. Flip-flop judgments and a surprise-a-month foreign policy.

How many of you remember on the eve of the fall of Vietnam the President's standing before the House and the Senate in joint session asking us to appropriate multi-millions of dollars, 720-odd millions of dollars, and the city was crumbling then and there. Surprise a month? We didn't grant the money, but I think it was about two or three days later when you saw on

television people escaping from the rooftops in Saigon. Does it make any difference? I think it does!

But this is the most important difference of all that it will make that result. We need a President who works with the Congress. The President and the Congress must cooperate if we are to have anything that could remotely be called progress. I have told you that in all probability, by all accounts, by all pollsters, by all measures, the Congress will remain majority Democrat. Now, if you want to get ahead in this country and have cooperation, and allay the bickering, the back-biting, the tension between the Oval Office and Capitol Hill, then it would be helpful if the President of the United States would be of the same party as the majority of the Congress. We've worked that way before and we did not suffer so badly when we had the President and the Congress working together. I think it's important that we do work together and I'll tell you why it's important. Because people are tired of us fussing and fighting. That's why it's important. They're tired of confrontations between legislative and executive. They are just a little bit weary of who is on first, the Congress or the President, in this instance.

So—a Democratic perspective for 1976: We want to win. We believe that we have the capacity to govern. We think it is important that the person who occupies the office of the Presidency regards the interests of people over, above, and beyond business interests, corporate interests, Pentagon interests. We believe that if a Democrat is in the Presidency, exercising leadership, not taking care of minutia, but giving us that spirit of a vigorous and vibrant leader, that we will be able to enact and implement tax reform, national health insurance, a jobs bill, an energy policy which is sensible. We believe that.

If you don't share that belief, I can understand that, because it is very difficult for anyone to feel that it makes any difference whatsoever who becomes President of the United States, that it is that multi-tiered thousands of people we label as bureaucrats who really run the country. I differ with that because, you see, in addition to being a politician, I am a patriot. Patriotism is an old-fashioned virtue. There are not many people who talk about patriotism anymore, but I do. I still get choked when I sing "God Bless America," and when I see the flag flying and hear the National Anthem, because I can be in this country as my country. I believe that.

And because I have that old-fashioned patriotism, I know that in order for my country to survive, the occupant of the Oval Office begins first with an unequivocal belief in God and then belief in his country. I believe that.

1976: A REPUBLICAN PERSPECTIVE

Howard H. Baker, Jr.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much for the warmth of your welcome and for the opportunity to be here with you and to discuss matters which I hope are of mutual interest.

It is my duty and responsibility today to give you a perspective of the upcoming elections of 1976 from a Republican perspective and I am delighted to do that. I commend you for this undertaking at a particularly significant time in our country's history. I have a great admiration as well as respect for the American political system. I'm speaking now of frank partisan politics, Republican-Democrat politics, Independent politics, or whatever you call it. I have a great devotion and respect for the two-party system in the United States, notwithstanding the recent unpleasantness that we refer to in the aggregate as Watergate. That really was not a significant commentary on the political system in this country and I commend to you that thought. It really was not. It was an unpleasant time for sure. Obviously it was unpleasant for me.

It was noted in the introduction that I was the first Republican ever elected in Tennessee to the Senate and that my father served in Congress. Incidentally, even though Tennessee has not always been a Republican state, that district, the second Congressional district of Tennessee, is the oldest Republican Congressional district in the United States with continuous Republican representation. What that means is that it elected its first Republican to the Congress in 1858 or 1860, depending on how historians interpret it—there is a quarrel over titles, whether it was Republican or whatever—but until this good day, it has never had anything else. I have deep traditions of Republicanism.

You can imagine the way I felt then during the Watergate hearings. I sat there hearing people who were not only my political compatriots but also my friends, whom I had known for years, in some cases, telling the most extraordinary set of circumstances and unfolding the most remarkable tales. I felt a little, if you'll pardon me in advance, like the farmer who discovered that his daughter had run off with a traveling salesman. The story goes that his wife got hysterical and ran from the room on receiving this terrible news. She tripped and fell on the kitchen steps and broke her ankle. She scared the team of mules. They bolted and were killed at the railroad crossing. On the way back from seeing about the mules, the farmer looked up and saw his barn was on fire. He threw up his hands and said, "God, what have I done to deserve all this?" There was a tumultuous clap of thunder and a flash of lightning and a celestial voice said, "Clyde, there's just something about you that irritates me." I've got to confess that I felt like that during the Watergate hearings with all that Republican background and tradition that my region of the country had brought to the party. But we lived through it.

I ran across the country in 1974 saying, "Look, you know, this was an anomaly in the political process. People ought not to blame Watergate on Republicans. Don't take it out on us." But they did anyway. We didn't do too well. And later I saw a friend I had spoken this way to in California. I said, "What happened? I thought you were convinced that it wasn't the Republicans' fault." And he said, "Well, it may not be your fault, but we didn't have to give you a merit badge for it!"

But 1976 is different, friends. We're done our due now and we've suffered our penance and it's time for politics in the traditional American scheme of things. And that's what I'd like to talk about.

The two-party system in the United States is unique

and special. It is purely the product of the American genius for self-government. There is no reference to it in the Constitution, nor in the Declaration of Independence, nor, in fact, any requirement for it in the body of the statute of laws, either on the federal or the state level. It is an innovation of the American talent for self-government that grew up spontaneously. It is also unique in another way. The two-party system in the United States consists of two broad-based national parties. They are not labor parties, conservative parties, socialist parties, communist parties, northern or southern, eastern or western parties. They are not guild parties or technician parties. They are general parties. They have a big tent, and they're anxious for everyone to come inside and to worship together in politics, if you please. They have an accommodating spirit, as I put it. They're not only willing, they are anxious to accommodate a wide variety of viewpoints and ideas and to translate them into an effective, unified, statement of policy in majority terms on any given election day. Now that's what the two-party system is all about.

It is unique and it exists nowhere else in the world. England has a two-party system, but it is crystallized along ideological or socio-ideological lines. France has the equivalent of the two-party system that is another variant. Other countries have multi-party systems. Some, like Russia, have a one-party system. Only in the United States do you have these two broad-based national parties, the national mechanism by which people of similar and like views gather together to try to win the right to serve by gaining the majority voice.

The party system is the machinery by which the sovereign speaks to the structure of government in the United States. It is the way you express your ideas to the engines and institutions of government because you indeed are sovereign. It is the sensing mechanism by which the government understands and reacts to the full range of the desires and the demands and the dissent of the people of this country. And in that way, my friends, the two-party system is in fact the functional equivalent of the fourth department of government, ranking in importance, in my judgment, with the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The party system, the sensing mechanism, the gathering together, the accommodating spirit, the sensing out, determining and reacting to not only the demands but the dissent of the sovereign, the people of this country, make it so important that I think it has the effective equivalency in importance to the other three departments of government.

So it is no great jump from that thesis to tell you that in my judgment, participation in public affairs, in frank partisan politics, is the most important secular understaking in which you may engage. And I commend it to you.

So much for the structure. Let's talk about how the mechanism is working and what it is working on in 1976. I want to talk about a few issues and save a little time for questions and answers. Before I address the three or four issues, it might be important to observe from my standpoint a couple of things that are happening in the issue arena.

I. Foreign Policy. Since Vietnam, since the radical changes in some respects in the relationships in NATO with France withdrawing her military forces, with the situation in Iceland, with the question of a rearming West Germany, with the Berlin Wall, and the like; it is clear to me that our post-World War II foreign policy —which consisted of a system of forward position defenses far from the shores of the United States—is no longer truly relevant to the requirements of our time and that we are, in fact, in the business of trying to formulate and state our first new foreign policy since World War II. I don't know what it's going to be, but I rather suspect I know some things it will not be or ought not to be.

First, I don't think the forward positions will work much any more, either through the Asian Crescent or behind the shield of NATO. How can you have an ocean moat when it is thirty minutes from here to Moscow by ICBM? In this age of instantaneous electronic communications and almost instantaneous transportation, when the have-nots of the world are rapidly finding out how much the have's really have, how can America enjoy her life-style behind her ocean moats? I don't think she can. I do not see a neo-isolationism emerging. I do not believe that the tiger will change its stripes or the leopard will change its spots. I don't think we're going to have a blind reliance without some sort of assurance, enforceable assurance, that there is no longer a martial danger in the world. I think we will come to the place where there must be a greater dedication to the defense resources in the United States.

But I think there is another change. I think that it is unlikely that massed land armies or numbers of battleships or even aircraft carriers will be the determining force in the equilibrium of balance of forces between the U. S. and the U.S.S.R., to say nothing of the People's Republic of China. I think, instead, that the quality of our technical achievements, the assurance, the adequacy, the certainty—the unassailable certainty —if our military might, and our retaliatory capacity is more likely to deter aggression and has, in fact, deterred aggression more effectively than our two-ocean blue-water navies. By the way, the Russians now, for the first time in their history, have a blue-water navy that is almost as big as ours and certainly newer than ours. I suspect our policy is going to be something akin to what President Ford won't speak of anymore and that's détente, what the conservatives in the country scream about as a give-away and what the liberals say is something else again. I don't know what it amounts to, but I spent the whole day on the floor of the Senate yesterday trying to say two things: That America's foreign policy consisted of an undoubted military strength unchallengeably strong on the one hand and the courage to negotiate limitation on strategic arms and to extend economic initiative on the other and I got the daylights beat out of me on the floor of the Senate. So I don't know what the policy is going to be, my friends, but one of the big issues in the campaign of 1976 ought to be, and I think will be, further deliberations on what America's new foreign and defense policy will be. In that respect, I'm not unhappy that you have the debate that is going on now with the Presidential contenders and others about what foreign policy or détente or economic policy ought to be. I think it's good. I think it is good because you see, America in her 200-year history has been remarkably right, in my judgment, on most of the big issues that have been presented to us. But not because our leaders

have always been remarkably right. America has been remarkably right, my friends, because you, the collective judgment of the people of the country, as determined by the political-sensing mechanism, have supplied remarkably right answers. The electorate, the political system, the sensing mechanism will determine what our new foreign and defense policy may be. So you see, it is fairly easy for me to say that I don't know what it's going to be, but I know it's going to be rough. But I have trust in you and your moral judgments and your attitudes and your perspective of history and your determination to stay free and strong.

II. Economic policy is and ought to be an issue in this campaign. It is my view, and I believe the Republican view, that the free market system simply cannot survive if it is continually encroached upon by further requirements for a greater and greater share of the Gross National Product and a smaller and smaller share of the GNP available to private resources, to philanthropy, to charities, to the private economy in general. It was pointed out to me recently that the sum total of all of the financial requirements of all levels of government—meaning the federal, state, county, city, and whatever—now either consumes or impinges directly on forty percent of the total Gross National Product of the country. Now I am not an accountant, but I don't think you can go much farther than that and expect to be able to call this the free market economy much longer. It is my view and hope and my expectation that in the campaigns of 1976, the people of this nation in their sovereign capacity will say, "Look, we are the most compassionate people on earth, and we have proven it and will continue to, but government is not the answer to everything and we cannot snuff out the energy, the creativity of the free market system. It's time for less government generally and not more." I think that this will be an issue in 1976.

III. This gets us to a fairly specific issue which is revenue sharing. I am a supporter of revenue sharing. The Republican initiative is in favor of revenue sharing. There are many Democrats who oppose it and some who favor it. Incidentally, Hubert Humphrey and I were the co-sponsors of the original bill which did pass. Hubert and I tried to convert it into a bipartisan position in 1968 and I think we succeeded by and large. Support for federal revenue sharing, general revenue sharing was made a part of both national party platforms in 1968, Republican and Democrat. Some of you may remember that. Humphrey and I introduced that bill and we negotiated a long time about formula and amounts. The bill passed and passed overwhelmingly.

But since that time, there is great opposition in many quarters to revenue sharing. It's an odd and strange combination. Some from the so-called liberal side of the spectrum say it's a bunch of nonsense. We could spend that money better in Washington than they can in Tennessee, in Knoxville, or Union County. And on the conservative side, they say, "Well, you know, there is a philosophical, a difficult anomaly in separating the taxing power from the spending power. Why don't we just let the local governments raise the money?" My brief answer to that is because it is a tradition in this country that the less rich parts of the nation have always been helped directly or indirectly by the richer parts of the country. That's what makes a nation safe. I consider that desirable instead of undesirable. But notwithstanding, there is an extraordinary, and I hope not an extraordinarily effective opposition to revenue sharing in 1976, and it will be an issue. I am happy to say that the Republican position will be in favor of a continuation and renewal of revenue sharing. It is my personal hope that the program will be renewed permanently and not on a term-of-years basis. I frankly don't think that will happen, but it ought to happen because local government demonstratively does a better job spending the money than the federal government. And the federal government demonstratively does a better job raising the money than local government. Why not combine the two? It has worked pretty well. How many of you have figured how much it has done to your local government?

My hometown is a tiny little town and I've been there a long time. We discovered the other day it was a centenary occasion for the founding of the city and my cousin and I decided it wouldn't be appropriate to celebrate a century of progress so we tried a century of status quo. But anyway my little hometown gets a little bit of revenue sharing as every little town or county or all the states do. A friend of mine came rushing in one day and said, "The city council last night just made a fool of themselves. They were fighting and scratching and carrying on about whether to build a new sidewalk to the high school or whether to build a playground in the public park. And they just made a fool of themselves. And all that is on account of your old revenue sharing. They never used to quarrel this way before they had revenue sharing. You see what you've done to this town?" I said, "I hope so. Because for 100 years, they never had anything to quarrel about!" And now they've got the wherewithall to do something useful and that's the very essence of government in this country. You are able to reach those who determine your destiny and your future. And in a small way that's what revenue sharing is.

IV. Another issue that is and ought to be a campaign issue in 1976, in which there is a less clearly define Republican and Democratic dichotomy, has to do with what I call the inevitable balance in our requirement for energy and the protection of the environment. And there is one that's going to be with you for a long time to come, and about which there will be great disputes. For the first time in the history of this country we are dependent to an extraordinary extent upon imported fuel. We are in many ways literally at the mercy of people outside this country for the sustenance of our economic and commercial machinery. We import about thirty percent of our liquid fuel and, of course, it is still possible to allocate that shortage if there were another embargo; but you all know what happened before and it wasn't even a complete and thorough embargo then. It is absolutely essential, in my view, that we do obtain a level of energy independence —no ifs, ands, and buts. It's got to happen simply because we cannot give the economic clout to say nothing of the impact on the foreign policy commitment of the United States, to another group of countries no matter how large or small.

I was in Saudi Arabia about a year ago, a country with four million citizens. There are seven or eight million residents but four million citizens. They had an

excess of income last year of $40 billion over their expenditures after they had bought and paid for everything they could think of. I saw the very essence of Arab oil as I was driving to the airport and this is the truth. There was an Arab in the traditional garb—the flowing white robe—with his camel, standing beside his copper-colored Cadillac changing the rear tire. I think they bought the whole year's output of copper-colored Cadillacs for Saudi Arabia. Their income bears no relationship to their power, to their needs, and I don't begrudge them that. The Lord put it there and I'm not about to participate in a foreign policy that would try to take it away from them. But I am going to say, "We say we're glad you've got that wealth. We're happy for you, and we want to see you improve your quality of life. But it can't be used as a prize pole to determine our quality of life. We have got to depend on our own resources." To do that, you get into all sorts of problems. You get into the question of the trans-Alaska pipeline, offshore drilling, nuclear power, oil shale, geo-thermal power, solar power, nuclear fission, and whatever exotic system you can think of. The cold, hard facts remain that we're probably going to have to do all those things if we have any expectation of making the grade.

However, to say, "Look, we don't need any more energy; let's just cut back thirty percent or stay where we are; after all, why do we have to do anything better?" is to say we're satisfied with our quality of life, but we condemn everyone else in this country never to improve theirs. I think that would be socially unacceptable. But the environment must be protected. The full cost of environmental insult must be internalized and added to the cost of producing the fuel, whether it's strip mining or shale mining. Whatever it is, the costs have to be reckoned with. We've got to get away from this business of the poorest regions of this country subsidizing the electric rates of the richest regions of the country. If you are going to strip coal, you ought to cover it up again.

These are only a sample of some of the issues that confront us. I know now what my father meant when he'd been in Congress for a few years and he came home perplexed and tired one night and said, "You know, some day somebody's going to bring me a problem where there's an easy solution." They never did in his time in the Congress and I'm about to begin to believe they never will in mine.

RECOVERING ECONOMIC INTEGRITY

Leonard Woodcock

It is a great honor and opportunity for me to join with you today at this Christian citizenship seminar. I want to thank Dr. Valentine and Welton Gaddy of your Christian Life Commission for inviting me to share some thoughts with you on the economic crisis facing this country and what should be done about it. As the president of a labor union which had, one year ago at this time, about 270,000 members out of work in the Big 3 auto companies alone, I have some strong views on the subject of "Recovering Economic Integrity" which Dr. Gaddy asked me to address.

We have, in recent months, been through one of the most devastating economic dislocations this country has ever experienced. At one point slightly more than one year ago, we had as many American workers unemployed as there were during the Great Depression of the 1930s. That fact alone makes it quite clear that we have been through a catastrophe of major proportions. Today, thirteen months after I led 10,000 of my fellow UAW members in a mass rally here in this city to impress upon our political leaders how devastating the Nixon-Ford recession really was, we are now beginning to experience a recovery.

That recovery is extremely fragile. It has been triggered in part by the right kind of emergency tax cut which, fortunately, the Congress made over President Ford's objections. Significantly, the auto industry is a leader in this recovery. This is an unusual development, in that in every recession since World War II the recovery has been led by housing and capital equipment spending. The marketing research experts tell us that consumer confidence has risen from the desperately low level of last winter, but that confidence remains weak. And it has leveled off at a point well below pre-recession readings.

Even with that slight recovery and the drop in unemployment reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we remain in the midst of what I believe to be our worst national crisis since World War II. The drop in unemployment, for example, still places the United States far above the unemployment rates of virtually every other industrialized country in the world. Not long ago, leaders of the Swedish trade union movement visited me in Detroit. During our discussions, I asked them the question, "How is the Swedish economy these days?" They responded with frowns. "Horrible," they said, "Just horrible." I asked them what their unemployment rate was. They answered: "It's very bad: 1.7 percent." We haven't had an unemployment rate that low since V-E day.

And right now, our political leaders including President Ford are attempting to convince us that things are better than they really are, by understanding the true magnitude of unemployment in this country. The real jobless rate is far higher than 7.6 percent, because the government does not count those unemployed workers who are so discouraged they have given up an active search for a job.

There are about one million Americans who fall in this category. In addition, there are another 3.3 million Americans who involuntarily hold only a part-time job, because full-time work is unavailable to them. None of these people are counted in the official unemployment tally, either. Using a conservative measure of 50 percent of their time as unemployed, another 1.7 million must be added to the true unemployment tally.

Thus, we have almost ten million people suffering in this country from unemployment, and a true jobless rate of close to 10.5 percent. Those are shocking numbers. But they are more than that. For each one of those ten million individuals, there is a personal story. In many cases, there is personal tragedy that affects not only the unemployed worker but his family as well.

Virtually every day, I receive letters at my office

in Detroit from workers who have been put on indefinite layoff by the auto companies. Their stories drive home the horrible reality of the Nixon-Ford recession.

Families are being broken up because of the incredible psychological strain—the loss of dignity and self-worth—that occurs when a worker can no longer bring home the paycheck that feeds and clothes the family.

We've seen an increase in drinking and drug abuse problems that's very alarming. Take the city of Flint, Michigan, for example, where auto workers fought the tough sit-down strike against General Motors that led to the formation of our union. Within the last year, during which unemployment at times hit 20 percent in Flint, it became the city with the highest rate of alcoholism in the country. Officials there have reported alcoholic treatment programs are 150 percent above the norm, with more than 77,000 family members touched by alcoholism. The drug treatment center there reports a new caseload twice what was projected for 1975.

Other statistics are just as alarming. Child abuse, for example, has risen seriously during this economic crisis. In 1973, when 9.6 million cars were produced in this country, cities like Flint had relatively high employment. In that year, there were eighty-four confirmed cases of child abuse. As we began to plummet into the recession-depression, there were 112 cases in 1974. Last year, with unemployment hitting 20 percent in Flint, and auto production down to 6.7 million, there were 230 child abuse cases—more than twice as many as 1973. The experts tell us these cases often are not the result of serious mental problems. Let me share with you the words of a young social worker in Flint, quoted in a recent issue of *The Progressive* magazine:

"The story has become so common in Flint, it would be a cliche if it wasn't so terribly sad. The man has been employed for maybe ten years. He had a decent income, a modest house, perhaps a camper and lots of payments. He had debts, sure, but he also had hope. Then came the layoffs. Still, he didn't worry. He had unemployment compensation and union benefits and felt he would be called back before long.

"But he didn't get called back and the special benefits ran out. He lived by the skin of his teeth even in good times, because there was always something to pay for. And now it gets worse and his optimism fades. He's around the house almost all day and he has fixed everything in sight. Something goes out of the family because he's around. He sees the kids when they are dirty and noisy and misbehaving. And they don't pay him the same attention they used to when they greeted him at the door when he came home from work.

"He had always had the disciplinary role around the house. He was the boss, the breadwinner. So his relationship with his wife changes. He bosses her around and demands she bring him a beer because he has to prove that he's still the man of the house.... In a situation like that, everybody in the house gets bent out of shape."

This young case worker in Flint, Greg Hilliker, goes on:

"I don't know how many cases I've had where the father admits that what his child did would normally not have been cause for a reprimand, or it would be overlooked. But in the house of the unemployed, there is so much tension it's like striking a match in a room full of gas fumes. The child misbehaves, the father loses his temper and smacks much harder than he intended. There is *no* evidence of sadism or serious emotional illness in most of the child-beating cases we have been seeing. . . . The hospital or the doctor shows me a child covered with bruises and when I ask the parents what happened, the father breaks down and tells me he did it. He says over and over again that he's sorry, that he simply lost control, that if he could only find a job he would make it up to the child.

"It may sound crazy," says the caseworker, "but most of the child beaters are concerned and loving fathers. And in a way they are driven to child-beating because they are."

This is the kind of horrible human tragedy that lurks behind those numbers of the unemployed that you and I read about each month. As a union leader, that kind of tragedy outrages me, as I'm sure it does those of you church men and women whose lives are based on the Christian code of compassion and concern for your fellowman. Unfortunately, it does not seem to have much of an impact a few blocks away from this hotel, down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Flint isn't that far from Grand Rapids, but somehow the message doesn't seem to get through.

We are seeing other evidences of the incredible human toll behind those unemployment statistics, too. Our experience in Flint is not a statistical aberration. National statistics from the Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect, for example, report that across the country child abuse cases increased 36 percent—from 280 cases per million population in 1972 to 380 in 1974. Another national study reveals that nearly 60 percent of abusive fathers were out of work at the time of the abuse or had been unemployed during the immediate year before abuse occurred.

The Division of Biometry at the National Institute of Mental Health recently circulated a private report to a select group of psychiatrists and psychologists around the country alerting them to expect a major increase in the mental hospital and jail populations as the result of unemployment. Other studies by respected scholars and institutions point to similar patterns.

Dr. M. Harvey Brenner, a Johns Hopkins University professor, recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. He detailed the kinds of stresses brought on by unemployment—the hormonal, physiological, and psychological changes that do damage to the body. His study shows a clear link between health and recession over the last seventy years. In periods of downturn in the economy, we see correlating increases in heart attacks, cirrhosis, alcohol abuse, suicide, infant mortality, and mental illness.

Dr. Brenner predicts we will be paying for the effects of the recession for years in the future, because there is a delayed reaction inherent in certain types of health problems, such as heart disease based on stress and resultant high blood pressure. His study

indicates our nation can expect the following increases in recession-related disorders:

—A 15 to 25 percent increase in heart attack deaths.
—A 30 to 35 percent increase in alcoholism.
—A 15 to 20 percent increase in the infant death rate.
—A 15 to 100 percent increase in mental disorders.
—A 15 to 25 percent increase in suicides.

I'm sure all of us in this room today hope Dr. Brenner is wrong. But even if these rates rise only by half of his estimate, we still will have a tragedy of epic proportions on our hands. You've heard yesterday afternoon from Senator Kennedy about the struggle to enact comprehensive health security in this country—an effort that both the Southern Baptist Convention and the UAW are involved in. The toll taken by this recession on the physical and mental health of millions of American workers and their families makes the enactment of a health security program even more pressing than it already was.

That toll has had a devastating effect even on those who aren't currently unemployed. For every person who got a pink slip during this economic crisis, there were two or three who believed they might, too. That kind of anxiety has had a more subtle, but still severe effect on this country. I think it has contributed greatly to the kind of cynicism evidenced in the current primary election campaigns.

A study conducted by the National Committee for Full Employment recently revealed that unemployment has touched the lives of many more people than the ten million plus who are unemployed. It found, for example, that 52 percent of the American people have been affected, either by suffering layoffs themselves, having a family member lose a job, losing overtime or having their work week cut.

Another poll, taken by Yankelovich and Associates last year, reported that one out of every two families believed the United States is heading for a major depression. For the first time in years, family anxieties over economic issues far outweighed their recent concern with such social issues as crime, education and the environment. More than half those surveyed reported severe concern about their own future financial well-being and security. Almost half said they felt a loss of self-sufficiency and a conviction that their future is not within their own control. Many of you are, as I am, concerned about the future of the American family. The current economic crisis is having a *devastating* impact on our family structure.

The one-two punch of Vietnam and Watergate sent this nation reeling, then came the knock-out blow to the American spirit: the Nixon-Ford recession. I think in addition to the incredible toll which we can weigh—the lost jobs, the increased crime, the physical and mental illness—we are now seeing a decline in the kind of compassionate, Christian spirit that should be most prevalent in times such as these. The New Testament tells us in Romans 14:7 (RSV): "None of us lives to himself and none of us dies to himself." It also admonishes us in Galatians 6:2a (RSV) to "Bear one another's burdens." Yet today we find candidates ignoring these admonitions, running on platforms calling for the destruction or severe limitation of the very programs most necessary to help people survive this crisis.

President Ford, for example, apparently thinks the way to stay in Washington is to run against Washington. Now Mr. Ford has lived in Washington for almost thirty years. Yet somehow he would have us believe that the problems we have are not those of his making, nor his party's making. He seeks to continue his control of the most powerful governmental bureaucracy in the world by running against government. This philosophy, as Henry Fairlie noted recently, is about the same as a saloon-keeper justifying an attempt to win a liquor license by saying he is a member of the Temperance Reform League.

Rather than dealing with the root causes of the economic crisis, these candidates have turned on its victims instead. Thus, they tell us the villain isn't a President who tolerates ten million American workers on the street in the mistaken view that doing so will dampen inflation and restore eroding corporate profits. The villain instead is the food stamp recipient, the welfare mother, the unemployed worker—the very people most damaged by the misguided policies of the White House and its occupant's confidants in the corporate boardrooms.

Thus, right now, we have President Ford pursuing policies that not only are based on the incorrect and immoral view that the country *needs* prolonged high unemployment. We also find him fighting with great vigor to slash the very social programs that are supposed to provide the unemployed and the poor with the ability, however slight, of mere survival. Worst of all, there is a real dishonesty inherent in the Administration's efforts to create the impression these programs are riddled with cheats and frauds.

Food stamps are a good example. A Senate subcommittee estimates right now there are more than twenty million people who are eligible for food stamps, but do not receive them. Yet Gerald Ford would slash 3.4 million from the food stamp rolls as they now stand. I'm sure we are all in favor of cracking down on those who abuse our government programs and eliminating waste—there is some of both present in the food stamp program as it stands today.

But there is nowhere near the degree of abuse in the program that Mr. Ford would have us believe. The Agriculture Department, run by Nixon Republican Earl Butz, did a survey last year that indicated the fraud rate in the food stamp program was less than 1 percent. The very small amount of misuse in the program costs far, far less than the millions lost to the federal treasury because of corporate fraud and error in withholding taxes each year.

Mr. Ford would cut the very programs that are most essential in a time of economic crisis.

He wants to slash unemployment insurance at the very time it's needed most; he wants to cut the percentage of our federal expenditures going to higher education; he wants to cut veteran's benefits; he wants to cut funds spent on health research, education, and prevention; he'd cut elementary, secondary, and vocational education programs. In contrast to these cuts, he proposes that we increase defense spending by 9 percent over fiscal 1976 levels.

He would have us believe that we as a nation have tried too much in the social arena—that we have spent

too much on the poor, the disadvantaged, the unemployed, the elderly and the sick. Like a stern father, he lectures us that we must cut back, that we have overspent and must bear the consequences. He would have us bear our social calamities, like those I've touched on here today, as if they were natural disasters over which we have no control. Those natural disasters, as usual, seem somehow to bypass the rich while they devastate the poor—like a tornado that rips apart the ghetto while scarcely creating more than a cool breeze at the country club.

A look at the figures makes it clear that spending on social programs has not caused our current federal deficit. The engineered unemployment of Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford is the real cause of that deficit. If we had the unemployment rate in the United States today that we had when Nixon took office in January of 1969, there would be no deficit. The budget would not only be in balance; it would be in substantial surplus.

When Richard Nixon took over in 1969 from President Johnson, our country had an unemployment rate of 3.6 percent and an inflation rate of 4.5 percent.

In the eight years since, Nixon and Ford managed to bring us unemployment of more than 9 percent and inflation of more than 12 percent. At one point or another in that period, more than fifty-seven million Americans have been out of work. The cost of the last two years of the recession in lost Gross National Product alone has been more than $300 billion.

John Kenneth Galbraith, the noted Harvard economist, recently criticized Ford's so-called economic experts—Alan Greenspan and William Simon—as men who "see progress as escape to the eighteenth century. . . . Had men of similar competence been in charge of the space program, we would now be digging the boys out of the Grand Canyon."

It needs to be emphasized that the budget deficits we face are the result of the unemployment problem. They do not reflect excessive government activity; in fact the federal government is doing too little—mainly because of restrictions enforced by the veto power of the President—to meet the problems of the economy. Too much concern has been expressed about the number of dollars in the deficit, and too little about the people who are unemployed. When we reduce the level of unemployment, the budget deficit will also be reduced.

President Ford's concern over cutting back spending programs of course does not apply to the "welfare for the rich" schemes such as the bail out for Lockheed through which we provided public funds used by Lockheed's executives to bribe foreign officials. Ford's program essentially is to slash social programs, delay any significant recovery, continue unemployment in an attempt to moderate worker's ability to win higher wages and thereby boost profits.

We in the UAW are about to begin negotiating with the four auto companies and with the major farm implement manufacturers. We are not unmindful of the suffering of our members during the last three years and we intend to straighten out at the bargaining table those issues that can be settled there. The UAW won twenty-one years ago a supplemental unemployment benefit plan, under which today an unemployed worker with appropriate credit units can receive 95 percent of his after-tax pay minus $7.50 per week while on layoff. This program, while never intended to endure the kind of massive economic dislocation we've just been through, played a crucial role in limiting to an extent the kind of suffering many other unemployed workers experienced recently. We plan to strengthen this supplemental unemployment benefit program in our negotiations in a few months. We plan to explore a variety of proposals aimed at increasing job security and expanding the number of jobs available, such as shortening the overall working time in the plant so that the employers must hire more workers. And we plan to do something about the eroding real income that our older members on pension have suffered.

But frankly, as one who has sat at bargaining tables for almost forty years, I'm aware of the limitations of the collective bargaining process. Much of what needs to be done to recover economic integrity in this country can only be done here in Washington, through the political process. It is up to the President and the Congress to get America moving again, to put America back to work. That is and must be the central issue in the 1976 campaign.

Just what should we do to get the country moving again? Well, I would be the first to admit that the UAW does not have all the answers. But we do have a program and I'd like in closing to touch briefly on some of the ways this country can recover the economic integrity it has lost under Mr. Nixon and Mr. Ford.

The most crucial single need we have in America today is jobs. We cannot continue to suffer the kind of human devastation that the Nixon-Ford recession has heaped upon us. Just a few days ago, Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins introduced a crucial bill that deserves widespread support. Called the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act Bill of 1976, it would commit the federal government to take appropriate actions to lower unemployment to 3 percent in not more than four years.

The bill would seek to create jobs in the private sector with the government serving as the employer of last resort. Under the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, a job would be guaranteed for everyone able and willing to work, with a public service employment backup with the same pay standards for those unable to find work. This is a realistic goal.

It has been achieved in other countries. Japan, for example, which was hit hard by the energy crisis, had an unemployment rate in 1975 of only 1.9 percent. Sweden's jobless rate was 1.7 percent. Italy had 3.6 percent, Germany 3.9, and France 4.3. Even the United Kingdom, which is experiencing major economic problems, had an unemployment rate of 4.9—little more than half that which we experience here.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill would attack the complacency with which our society has begun to accept high unemployment, with all the resultant social cost and human tragedy. Under the Nixon and Ford Administrations, unemployment figures of 7, 8 and 9 percent have become the norm rather than the exception and that is very dangerous.

Mr. Ford would have us believe, as did Richard Nixon before him, that reducing unemployment automatically means that inflation will skyrocket. That

argument centers on the old Keynesian concept that the price of full employment is inflation. The Ford strategy is this: more American voters are affected by inflation than are harmed by unemployment—therefore, we should keep unemployment relatively high to dampen inflation.

As in so many of his views, Mr. Ford and the Wall Street bond salesmen he's brought in to advise him on how to run the economy, are terribly wrong. Our recent experience of high unemployment *and* double-digit inflation at the same time suggests that the old economic wisdom, if you can call it that, isn't working. In many areas of our economy, we now find that the old rules have changed, as we head toward an administered price structure instead of one based on supply and demand.

The auto industry is an example. Decreases in demand, which are supposed to lead to lowering of prices, have generally led to higher prices instead. The auto companies are large enough and concentrated enough to make up for declining sales volume and higher unit costs by raising their prices in order to continue to meet previously established profit targets. Thus, while demand slacked off for cars in 1975, we did not see car prices similarly decreasing. We had acres and acres of Detroit covered with automobiles—a huge oversupply—yet even with the stop-gap rebate plans, prices were higher than in years earlier when demand was quite high.

The massive unemployment we suffered didn't cause the price of the car you buy to come down. Other segments of the economy differ, of course, but what is clear is that it is incorrect to continue to assume, as Mr. Ford does, that the price of limiting inflation is eight to ten million Americans out of work. That would be an immoral trade-off even if it were true. But it's not and it's about time the White House realized that.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill also contains some provisions for national economic planning that are crucial. In addition to setting specific goals for employment, it would also require the federal government to fix specific numerical goals in other areas, such as production of goods and services, monetary policy and capital need for industry. Goals also would be set to insure that social needs would be met, such as adequate housing, health care, environmental protection, and others.

We think the question no longer is whether or not planning is necessary, but rather what kind of planning we'll have and who will benefit from it. The Humphrey-Hawkins bill is a good start toward the kind of democratic national economic planning this country needs. It addresses not only the pressing need for a full employment policy in this country, but also provides appropriate mechanisms aimed at insuring ordered, responsible growth.

I believe it will be passed by the Congress, although I do not believe that Mr. Ford will sign it into law. If he does not, that act alone will, more than any other failing, cause the election of a President who will put America back to work.

There are a host of other reforms that I believe are necessary, in addition, to restore economic integrity. Many of you are probably filling out your income tax forms right about now. We desperately need major tax reform in this country that would close the loopholes. Why, for example, should earnings from capital be taxed at a lower rate than earnings from labor? Why should the rich be allowed to escape their obligations by setting up phony farming operations? Why should corporations be able to add billions of dollars to their profit statements by receiving tax preferences for foreign-earned income that makes it preferable to export American jobs?

We need to establish a federal government lending program to facilitate construction of low income housing while providing jobs in the building industry. We need to reform the Social Security system by raising the wage-contribution base and ultimately introducing general revenue financing. We need a comprehensive health security program that will make health care a right rather than a privilege. We need to federalize the unemployment compensation system to insure equal and consistent benefits for those who are temporarily unemployed. We need public corporations in certain fields that could serve as yardsticks for private industry in production, pricing and employment practices. We need a National Energy Production Board to plan and execute a vigorous program to develop our energy resources quickly and responsibly.

But the central need, as I have said, is to put America back to work by adopting a policy of full employment through democratic national planning. Today, as we meet here in Washington, I urge you to pause for a moment and reflect on the ten million men and women out of work. Think of the tens of millions of human tragedies occurring right now as a result—the divorce, the alcoholism, the child abuse, the mental illness, the suicides, and the more subtle, but just as real, loss of personal pride and dignity.

It does not have to be that way—indeed, we as Christians and Americans must act to see that such tragedy ends. If we don't, we cannot consider ourselves a moral and humane society.

THE NATION YET TO BE: CHRISTIAN MISSION AND THE NEW PATRIOTISM

James Armstrong

It is a genuine privilege to be here. The first fourteen years of my ministry were spent in the Southeast and I was surrounded by Southern Baptists—almost immersed *in* you—and so now to return in a sense to the fold and have an opportunity to "have at you" is a rare privilege. I deeply appreciate the work of Dr. Valentine, your executive. We have been corresponding and relating to one another across these recent years. I have looked over your agenda. It is unbelievable! By now you ought to be spilled over with the input, the data, perhaps the inspiration, and certainly the information that has been coming your way.

I would like to read for you from the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, beginning with the thirty-first verse some very familiar words: "When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit in state on his throne, with all the nations gathered before him" (NEB). Then you remember, they will be separated into two groups,

and will be judged on the basis of their response to human need, human alienation, and human powerlessness. Some will be identified by and with the Father, and others will be rejected into eternal punishment.

A few weeks ago, I was asked to fill out a questionnaire on behalf of a brilliant young man who had applied for a White House Fellowship. One of the questions read like this: "What does he believe about the government?" Well, how do you answer a question like that? What government? Local? State? National? What arm of the government? The House Ways and Means Committee, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Warren Court, the Blackman Court, the CIA, FBI, IRS? I have an idea any number of us would have mixed feelings about the government. So after giving it some thought, I finally wrote: "He believes in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights." To believe in the inalienable rights of human beings, to believe in liberty and justice for all, to believe in freedom of religion, speech, thought, and assembly—these are the hallmarks, the foundation stones of our republic.

I did my most youthful growing up in northern Indiana. It was an idyllic time and place to be. It was a culture that was captured on countless canvasses by Grant Wood and Norman Rockwell. There were a couple of days that loomed large every single year of that early boyhood. One was Memorial Day. We would pile into the family Chevy, Dad would mount two American flags on the front fenders and we would drive south about a hundred miles to the family cemetery where my oldest sister was buried. And invariably, either driving down or coming back, Dad would recount once again the story of Uncle Andy—a Captain in the Infantry, shot between the eyes just before the Armistice was declared in 1918. It was a sobering day, and yet an instructive and memorable day for a little boy.

A day I enjoyed far more was the Fourth of July. Forty-five years ago, and obviously none of you remember that far back, we had a lot of patriotic parades and rhetoric, and family picnics, and best of all, fireworks—ladyfingers and torpedoes, firecrackers and skyrockets. As Archie Bunker would say, "Those were the days." And they were in some respects—simple, innocent days of unquestioned and unquestioning patriotism. But much of that has changed. The innocence is lost—McCarthyism, political assassinations, Vietnam, Watergate, CIA, FBI have seen to that.

Now, the reason I changed my topic just a bit, narrowing the gauge down some, was because last week I returned from South America, having visited Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile. I came into this city a little more than a month ago for a briefing at the State Department and heard from persons in authority all about these lands and our official policies toward them. I tried to do my homework—read the articles, read the books, talk to the people, get the names to contact.

In South America, we went from Montevideo to Colonia in Uruguay, and from Buenos Aires toward the Andes to Mendoza in Argentina, and then the last week, we were in Santiago, Chile. The final day I was there the Embassy in Santiago called and asked if I would like to visit. The State Department had wired ahead that we were coming. So I dropped by and we settled back in our chairs. The man in charge of the political affairs desk said, "Well, what did you think about it all? Is it the way you thought it would be, the way it has been described in the North American press?" So, I tried to recapture the events of recent days, driving from Montevideo out to Colonia by Libertad (Liberty), the prison where between three and four thousand political prisoners are being held by a military government. It is said that there are more political prisoners per capita in Uruguay today than in any other Latin American nation. I talked with two Christian idealists while there—not Marxists, but Christian idealists—one a young pastor, the other a Roman Catholic and former university professor. Each had been arrested and detained without charges. Each had been tortured.

I talked with a ninety-one-year-old bishop who was indignant because he was not imprisoned. The police had come two years earlier. He had been sick in bed. They had permitted him to talk with the doctor. So the doctor had come, but the police never returned. The old bishop felt that, somehow, he had let his country down. He had not been able to say the essential word he wanted to say. You see, Uruguay today is a military government, militarily trained and fully sustained by the United States. Elections have been called off. There won't be elections in November! It's a different sort of world.

One afternoon while there, we went out to the home of the first deputy of our mission, sat in beautiful, sun-drenched comfort, and talked about our role there in this government. The man, a native of North Dakota, said, "We have nothing to be ashamed of here. We fully identify with this government"—a military government with no elections that holds political prisoners who are tortured!

And now, I was in Chile responding to this question in our Embassy.

You know the story of Chile. On September 11, 1973, with pinpoint precision, bombers from the Chilean Air Force swooped down on La Moneda, the Presidential Palace, and strafed it, bombed it, murdered the president, and overthrew a constitutional government. Congress was dismissed and the Constitution was abrogated. Political parties on the left were outlawed and those in the center and on the right were put "in recess," a recess that continues to this present time. All of the electoral rolls of every one of the political parties were burned. Then began a reign of terror, a reign of terror that continues though it is now more psychological than physical. Today, there are thousands and thousands of political prisoners in Chile, as the military junta has taken over the university system, the trade union system, the media, all decision-making processes.

I read before going, as part of my homework, the report of the Senate subcommittee that had investigated the role of the CIA in Chile between 1963 and 1973. The CIA, which in cooperation with ITT and other multi-national corporations, had funneled multiplied millions of dollars into Chile, first in 1963 and 1964 to thwart the presidential ambitions of Salvador Allende, and from 1970 on to subvert his government.

A week ago last Sunday night, the American Ambassador had a party in his home. Three United States Congressmen were asked to attend and the man with

whom I was talking in the Embassy had said to Congressman Harkin from Iowa—referring to the junta—"You know these are our kind of people." A former CIA agent named Agee who served in Ecuador has recently written a book about his experience. Now, Ecuador is just "peanuts" as South American countries go (in the light of the Jimmy Carter phenomena, that's not all bad). But the CIA had a budget there of $500,000 a year, and according to the former agent, they had managed to infiltrate government, trade unions, education, and even an umbrella organization called the World Youth Fellowship, which had among its participating members the Boy Scouts and the Junior Red Cross.

Senator Mark Hatfield, who will speak during your seminar, is one of the heroes of this city and this land. One of the notable things he has done in recent months is his uncovering of the CIA's use of Christian missionaries in foreign fields. They didn't use exchange students. They didn't use Peace Corps volunteers. I resent that! They just used *missionaries.* In our denomination —I'm sure yours was not thus tainted—we had one missionary, back fifteen or twenty years ago, who, on the basis of his widow's testimony, was employed by the CIA in South America. The Methodist superintendent of the Santiago District, (pardon my denominational jargon), a Chilean, had worked with this man in Bolivia. So we talked about the CIA and its use of missionaries. Here was a young South American who had labored by the side of a trusted missionary, a servant of Christ paid by the U. S. government to inform on his people. And the man just shrugged and said, "When I heard it, I couldn't believe it. And yet, I guess that's the way things were, and are. Is it any wonder that wherever we went in Latin America, the silent question was: "Can we trust you?"

Interestingly enough, the CIA is not considered the primary villain, the chief scapegoat in Latin America today. Rightly or wrongly, those in influential positions suggest that the CIA is, at last, coming under the control of the United States Congress. They argue, however, that the Pentagon is not under that control. And it is the Pentagon with its war colleges and its training school in Panama, with its pervasive influence, that has trained the military leadership and the national police of the military governments that now dominate the life of South America—Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Chile. The tax dollars that provide that service come from *you and me.* In talking with this man in the Santiago Embassy, I confessed I considered it ironic that I would be privileged to return to this, my beloved country, to talk as I am talking to you today, critical of policy, critical of program, because I am as yet protected by the Bill of Rights. Yet I and 200 million others like me are responsible through our tax dollars and our apathy and our acquiescence for permitting our government to aid and abet these other military governments, which we hypocritically call a part of the "free world," where the masses are subjugated, brutalized, and tyrannized even as we use them for our economic, political and military purposes.

Now the question: "How in a nation that seeks to be under God, a nation whose revolution is still uncompleted, the vision unfulfilled, how in this nation can churches be what they ought to be—speaking the essential word, doing the essential deed, representing the essential cause?"

Where conscience permits, the church will be chaplain, pastor, counselor, offering spiritual resources to society, to institutions of government. Some of us were extremely impatient with Billy Graham during the Vietnamese war, and later during the early stages of Watergate because his voice appeared to be muffled —and he had been called by both friend and detractor alike the nation's chaplain. And yet, there was a moment in the early 60's when he played an heroic part in that role. President Lyndon Johnson, trying to get through Congress essential Civil Rights legislation, called upon the world-famous evangelist to meet with a group of Southern and Midwestern Congressmen. The evangelist came. A congressional friend of mine who serves a rural district in Indiana said that he had never heard a more reasoned, more impassioned plea for justice than was offered by Dr. Graham that day. United States senators representing varied perspectives from the position of Senator Hubert Humphrey, who spoke here this morning, to Senator Russell at the other extreme, argued both with anger and pride that had it not been for the churches of this nation, there would have been no civil rights legislation.

You see, the church *can* serve as chaplain. Abraham Lincoln called Bishop Matthew Simpson into his Cabinet on at least two occasions: Once, early in the War Between the States, to interpret something of the mood of the country (Matt Simpson, who itinerated across the northern part of the country, understood that mood); and, toward the last the President called the Bishop in to talk specifically and pointedly with Secretary of War Stanton, to try to moderate some of Stanton's extremely hostile views toward a defeated South. So, the churchman came as chaplain to speak to national issues in the name of reconciliation.

Now, this is biblical: In the Chronicles, we read of King Hezekiah's "good reign." Hezekiah assumed the responsibility of the throne in his early manhood. He continued with it for thirty years, cleansed the temple, threw open its doors and brushed down the cobwebs from its walls, and consecrated its priests. But at his elbow, through the years of that good reign, was one named Isaiah, who, any way you read the record, appeared to have been the most politicized of the prophets. He shared in decisions of statecraft and counseling, while still uttering the judgments of God. He was able to work within the establishment to influence it. There are risks involved in this as in any authentic ministry—the risk of compromise, the risk of ego-tripping satisfaction. Oh, to be wooed and seduced by the powers and principalities of this world. But he withstood, and was faithful.

Dom Helder Camera, the heroic Archbishop of Olinde and Recife in Northeast Brazil, is a name to be dealt with in the contemporary church. He began as a youthful priest, appealing to the imaginations of the young and the working class in Brazil. Before 1964, because of the charismatic quality of his leadership and character and because of the authenticity of his ministry, he had gained an influence in the Brazilian government beyond that of any other churchman. He was chaplain on the basis of an authentic ministry to issues and public figures. In 1964, the generals revolted and overthrew that government and Dom Helder Camera put on another mantle.

You see, the church and Christian are *chaplain* when conscience permits. But the church and Christian become prophet when conscience requires. Suddenly Dom Helder, this man who had been the confidante of government, saw human right being violated everywhere he looked. It was only a matter of months before he had accumulated a dossier of 12,000 names—the names and case histories of political prisoners, persons who had been tortured by the military and the police in Brazil. He took the dossier to Pope Paul VI. The Pope directed a message to the government of Brazil —a government ruling the largest Roman Catholic population in the world—telling them to cease and desist. They didn't! But the church was enabled to speak because of the prophetic courage of a man whose name cannot to this day be mentioned in the Brazilian press, whose itinerary cannot be revealed, who cannot be quoted, and yet who has three times been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize—a prophet in a disordered nation.

We don't have to be told of the role of the prophet in biblical revelation. Sometimes we need to be reminded by our Jewish brothers and sisters that Moses was the first of the prophets. They know that and call him prophet. We tend to box him into the law-giving role. It was this remarkable man, the privileged son of Pharaoh's court, who stood before the mightiest ruler of his day and cried, "You let my people go!" When the cry fell on deaf ears, Moses led those in bondage on their quest for liberation from their servitude, across the Red Sea, and into the howling wastes of the wilderness. Amos, of the same tradition, unpopular though he was and brief his ministry, cried out against war crimes and atrocities, against the institution of human slavery and economic injustice. "You sell the poor for a pair of shoes," he said [see Amos 2:6]. "You violate the covenant!" Jeremiah, who refused to bend his knee in the presence of civil religion and nation worship, who argued disturbingly that God was using the enemy to do his will among persons on earth in his day, who because these words of judgment and prophecy were so critical was humiliated in public and imprisoned and finally died in distant exile, his faith laughed to scorn.

Jesus considered himself in that tradition. Speaking to the most self-righteous and self-impressed religionists of his day, he said, "Your fathers kill prophets, though you build monuments to them" [Matthew 23:29-31, paraphrased]. Talking to those who would serve his righteousness in this world, he said, "You will be put upon and prosecuted as prophets always have been" [Matthew 5:11-12, paraphrased], and thus he died, nailed to a cross.

There are issues today begging for attention in this nation. Racial justice has not become fully realized; economic justice is certainly not fully realized; women and men do not have equal rights before the law or in society. There are a thousand things in our own land that need the concentrated attention of Christian conscience. To view the problems of hunger and forms of slavery and brands of inhumanity around the world reminds us that the church dare not extract itself from life and stand apart. The place of prophetic ministry is still central in the experience of the church.

Some of us need to stop taking statistics quite as seriously as we take them, stop counting our money quite as greedily as we count it, stop taking pride in our treasuries as we take that pride, and remember that the cross is still the central symbol of the faith. We are not called upon to win religious popularity contests in our kind of world.

The church and the Christian are called upon to be more than chaplain when conscience permits and prophet when conscience requires. The church and the Christian are called upon to be "presence"—presence, whenever and wherever the human situation exists. Ours is an incarnational flesh. Jesus of Nazareth was the Word made flesh. The church is God's colony in a human world. We, therefore, are called upon to represent him—to be *in* the world, but not of it—to represent him in the lost and disordered environments of our time.

Probably the most satisfying single night we spent in South America was at the home of Cardinal Silva Henrique in Santiago, Chile. I first met him in 1972 when I was in Santiago for the Third United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Salvador Allende was president. The Cardinal was walking a delicate tightrope. We talked. He supported the constitutionality of the government. He was grateful for many of the reforms that were taking place. He was critical of certain things he considered extreme. He took issue with the philosophy of Marx-Leninism. But it was a delicate tightrope and he was willing to speak out and run the risks.

Now almost four years later, he was still walking an extremely delicate tightrope, though the government had changed. For now, his is the most effective voice speaking out against the violation of human rights in Chile. He represents the Catholic Church, and in that sense is almost untouchable. So, in the light of the reign of terror, the denial of human rights, and the patterns of cruel arrest and detention of thousands of political prisoners, it is the cardinal's voice that has been raised on their behalf. Just before the Allende government was overthrown Cardinal Silva gathered about the table where we ate our evening meal representatives from the Christian Democrat party, representatives of the military, and President Allende to try to keep a constitutional government intact. He was the chaplain. He was the prophet. He was also the presence. He understood that the church is the body of Christ and not an extension of culture, that the church is called upon to run risks and make sacrifices, to be misunderstood, if need be, for righteousness' sake. Chaplain, prophet, presence—an extension of Christ's ministry into this world.

There is much in the United States land for which we can be profoundly grateful today—the privilege that makes it possible for us to gather like this and be who we are and say what conscience dictates. But with this remarkable freedom, we have tremendous responsibility. For there are wrongs to be righted, a future to be molded, and a prayer to be fulfilled—a prayer we each pray when we pray that God's will might be done on earth even as it is in realms beyond. "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required," said our Savior (Luke 12:48b, KJV). So much has been given us, and we are called day-in and day-out in a thousand different ways as Americans and as Christians to respond.

THE PRICE OF PEACE

Les Aspin

It is, indeed, a great pleasure and honor for me to be here this afternoon and to have a chance to talk a little bit about some of the things that I am very concerned about and very interested in—the price of peace, the size of the defense budget, and the amount of the defense forces that we ought to have. The country is facing that question again.

The Defense Department budget is something that, depending upon the mood of the country, either increases or decreases. During the cold war of the 1950s, of course, the mood was always to have more. When the war in Vietnam became unpopular, the mood was clearly to cut it. I think now that Vietnam is behind us, we are entering a period that is very much like the period of the early '60s, before we got into that war, when people have a chance—without the cold war going on—to look at the question as dispassionately and as objectively as possible. The question is "How much is enough?"

That quote comes from a speech by Secretary McNamara, which he gave in San Francisco. The full text of it is something like this: "In defense you just can't go around buying things that would be nice to have. You have constantly to ask yourself the question, 'How much is enough?' " In answering that question, you come up against an awful lot of specious arguments—arguments which sound good and, if they are not analyzed, probably carry the weight of helping to mold public opinion.

You hear, for example, that the Defense Department budget today takes up a smaller percentage of the Gross National Product since this part of the budget of the Defense Department has decreased. You hear, for example, that we have fewer forces (meaning ships, planes, and divisions) now than we had in 1964. You hear, for example, that today we are spending more on human problems than we are on defense-related problems. All of these things you hear; and they are put out in the form of charts, graphs, and information. The problem with all of them is that they do not tell you very much about how much we ought to spend on defense.

Take, for example, the percentage of the Gross National Product argument. It is absolutely true. The percentage of the Gross National Product that the United States is devoting to defense is declining. It is now down to about five percent. At the height of the Vietnam War, it was about 9.2 percent or 9.3 percent. It has been dropping since 1968. But what difference does that make? What is the relationship between Gross National Product and defense spending? The size of the Gross National Product depends upon the amount of goods and services produced in the country—which depends upon, of course, the relationship to the number of people. If you have more people, you have more Gross National Product. If you have higher inflation, you are going to have more Gross National Product. But what does that have to do with the amount of money that you spend on defense?

Maybe you can make a case that there is some relationship between Gross National Product and the amount that ought to be spent on education—at least that makes some kind of sense! But there is no relationship between Gross National Product and the amount that ought to be spent on defense. That makes no sense at all!

It does not cost any more or any less to defend a country if it is a wealthy country or if it is a poor country. It does not cost any more or any less to defend the United States if there are 300 million people in it or 100 million people. In fact, if you are thinking in terms of what factors influence the size of the defense budget, it is the geography of the country and the kind of threats that the country faces. It has nothing to do with the Gross National Product.

Depending upon what is happening, maybe two percent of the Gross National Product going to defense is too much, or maybe twenty percent is not enough. Gross National Product does not tell you anything!

How about the fact that we have fewer forces now than we had in 1964—fewer divisions, fewer tanks, fewer ships? That also is true. But there are a couple of things to be said about that.

In the first place, the world is very different from the way it was in 1964. In 1964 the Russians and Chinese were in alliance. It was well known that anytime we had a fight with the Russians, we would also be involved in a fight with the Chinese, and vice versa. Now that is not true. There has been a split. In fact, the most likely war to break out in the world right now would be a war *between* China and Russia. So, we don't have to be prepared to fight simultaneously as many of the potential enemy as we thought.

Also, since 1964 I hope we have learned something about playing policeman in the world and that too would tell you that perhaps we do not need so many forces as we had in 1964.

However, there is a third factor: perhaps we have more forces even though we have fewer numbers: The number of divisions we have is a little less. The number of ships and planes is less, but the ships and planes are better. The planes that we are buying now cost a lot more than they did ten years ago. Now, in part, that is because of cost overruns but, in part, it is also because the ships and planes are better. There is more fire power; there is more mobility; and there is more capability built into the equipment. Even though we have fewer numbers it is not at all clear that we have less defense than we had ten years ago.

The final point that is claimed is that we are spending more now in human resources than we are spending on defense resources. That, of course, depends upon what you put into human resources and what you put into defense resources. And basically, the numbers can be made to look larger or smaller, as lots of people figure those numbers in different ways. But I think the basic point is true. There has been a reordering of priorities in this country and money has shifted away from defense and in favor of social programs. You would never know it by looking at current dollars, but if you eliminate inflation and look at real dollars, there has been a shift away from defense to other programs. But again none of this tells you how much you should spend on defense.

There is one final argument being brought up now and I call it to your attention because it is this year's main argument for why we ought to spend more on defense. And that is, the Russians are coming. The Russians are spending more on defense than we are. I

am sure you have seen it in the big account in *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines recently. There have been lots of stories in the newspapers and on television about it. The Russians are outspending us on defense; therefore, it is time for the United States to increase its defense spending. That is this year's argument and it is carrying a lot of weight, I must say, with a lot of people who should not be believing that.

Let us look at the argument. What the argument is saying is that in terms of the American dollar the Russians are spending forty percent more on defense than the United States is. If you exclude the money we spend on military pensions, the Soviet Union is spending fifty percent more than the United States on defense. Now, what about that? Well, the key words in that statement are "the American dollar." Clearly what happens is that the Soviets do not spend dollars on their defense. Somehow, what the Soviets do with their defense must be put into some kind of terms which can be compared with what the United States is doing with their defense.

It is very interesting to understand how the intelligence community—the CIA—makes these kinds of estimates. What the CIA does is to go out and look at the Soviet defense establishment—the planes, the ships, the manpower, and the divisions they have, and then they calculate what it would cost to buy that Soviet military establishment in the United States at United States prices, and they compare it with what we are spending. Take a Soviet tank, for instance. They ask, "How much would it cost in the United States for the labor, the metal, and everything else? How much would it cost to build that in the United States?" They calculate the whole Soviet defense budget that way and then compare.

Now, that is an interesting way to do it, but it has certain biases. The main bias is what it does to manpower cost. The Soviet Union uses a lot of manpower because manpower is cheap. The United States uses less manpower because it is expensive. Calculating the manpower intensive defense budget in U.S. manpower prices results in an enormous bill for manpower defense which the Russians do not really pay but which comes through on our calculations. The absurdity of this calculation can be seen in that if we were to reduce our military pay scales, it would drop the U.S. budget some, but it would drop the Soviet's budget by a lot more. In fact, using the dollar comparison, the single most important reasoning for the Soviet's spending more on defense than the United States is that the United States decided to go to an all-volunteer army and to pay the army comparable wages.

Is there any other way to look at this thing? Yes. The other way is the reverse of the dollar comparison; that is, to look at the United States' spending on defense and the Soviet's spending on defense in terms of rubles, the Soviet currency. Now, when you do that, you look at what the United States has—the number of ships, planes, and manpower—and calculate what it would cost the Soviet Union to buy all that in rubles. Then compare that amount in rubles with what the Soviet Union is spending on its own defense in rubles. When you do that kind of calculation, you come up with something altogether different. In fact, you find out the United States is spending more than the Soviet Union!

The United States uses a lot of technology in its military because technology is relatively inexpensive in the United States. Technology is very expensive in the Soviet Union. So, if you were trying to buy the United States' defense force which is very technologically oriented, in the Soviet Union it would cost a bundle to buy that same defense force. It is the same as if you wanted to buy the Soviet's defense forces in the United States. The Soviet Union uses a lot of manpower and manpower is very expensive in the United States. It would cost the United States a bundle to buy the Soviet's defense forces in dollars because of the cost of manpower.

So, what it all comes down to as to who is spending more depends upon which comparison you use. If you use dollars, it turns out that the Soviets are spending more than the United States. If you use rubles, it turns out that the United States is spending more.

There is one thing that the people, who argue that the Soviet defense budget is something we should worry about, are saying that we ought to think about. They say that the Soviet defense budget has been increasing in recent years while the United States defense budget has been decreasing. And that is a valid point. It does seem to be true, however you calculate it. The Soviet defense spending has been going up and the United States defense spending has been going down.

You hear all kinds of extraordinary statements about Soviet defense spending increasing by phenomenal percentages. The truth is that Soviet defense expenditures have been increasing from one percent to five percent per year but the average over the past ten years, 1964-1974, has been an increase of 2.7 percent a year for the Soviet Union. The United States, when you net out the effects of Vietnam, has been decreasing over that same period by about one percent a year. Now that, potentially of course, is something to worry about!

But there is another factor. Where are the Soviet increases in spending going? If they go to NATO, that is one thing. If they go to defenses out on the Chinese border, that is another thing. When you look through the whole business and make your calculations, you come to the conclusion that somewhere in the order of one to 1.3 percent, somewhere near half, of the Soviet increases are the kind that threatens the United States.

So, a 1.3 percent increase in defense spending is what is going on in the Soviet Union. That is the whole argument. Don't let anybody tell you anything more than that! This 1.3 percent is something that can't be ignored but it is not the horrendous increase that some have been saying.

Now, two questions remain. First, why is the Soviet Union doing this? Second, what is the United States to do about it?

There are three different points of view on why the Soviets are increasing defense spending. One might be called the Melvin Laird point of view. The Melvin Laird point of view is that the Soviets are using détente as a smoke screen. They are building up their defense forces. They are going to face the United States with an overwhelming military superiority at some point. That is view number one.

But there is a second view which says that what is going on here is really the timing of budget decision.

The budgets go through cycles. You start out when you are building a major new weapons system, like the four new strategic rockets the Soviets are building. It starts out slowly and builds up and costs a lot of money. Then it tapers off. That argument says that this increase in spending started before 1972 when the SALT agreements were signed. And, if you really want to see what is happening to détente, you are going to have to wait until this deployment phase is finished. in other words, you are going to have to wait until the end of '77 and the beginning of '78 to find out whether the Russians are really making changes in defense or not, or whether it is just a cycle of this deployment.

The third point of view says that the military in the Russian political system is a powerful group and that Mr. Brezhnev is trying to do things with détente and the agreements on SALT and other things with the United States, and in order to do that he has to buy off his military by giving them a little more money for their budget every year in order to keep them happy. It is not an unknown phenomenon in our system.

Anyway, whatever theory you believe, and they are all viable theories with people arguing in favor of all of them, the real question, I think, is what is the United States to do with its defenses given the fact that the Russians are increasing defense spending at about 1.3 percent a year in a way that might be considered a threat? What will we do about that?

Well, one thing is that the Pentagon thinks that is an argument for passing the President's budget untouched. The President's budget is a six percent increase in real terms over last year, a twenty-two percent increase in the weapons system account. The Pentagon is hoping that that is an argument for passing the Defense Department budget unaltered. I hope it isn't! But that is one possible outcome. We could go ahead and pass the enormous defense budget this year.

The second possible outcome is to say that we should increase the defense budget a little bit, maybe one or two percent a year just to offset the Soviets. That is one to two percent in real terms. So far as I can tell, the only reason for doing that would be political and psychological. I cannot think of any area that would really require a greater increase in American defense expenditures. Perhaps there is a political and psychological reason which is appealing and which might argue for a one to two percent increase.

Others would argue that you ought not to increase it at all, that there is at least a one to two percent improvement in efficiency you can make in that system. This argument says that we need to have greater efficiency and that the system needs to be improved and there are a lot of expenditures which are not very intelligent and not very productive, and we ought to shift them around and get more from the way we are spending our defense dollars.

Other people say we really ought to see if there is not some way we can bring Soviet total defense expenditures into negotiations with the Soviet Union, like the SALT agreement, and try to broaden the talks and include somehow the total defense spending into these negotiations.

There are arguments being made for all of these courses of action. But in getting back to the basic question we ought to be asking ourselves, for our own defenses, for our own taxpayer's money, for our own safety, "How much is enough?" How much defense spending is enough?

The question really is not what are the Russians doing. The question is not how much of the GNP we ought to spend. It is not what we spent in 1964. It is not how much we are spending on human resources. The question is "How much is enough?" What the situation calls for now is really a basic reexamination of the Defense Department budget, a basic kind of fundamental examination of where we are and what we want to do.

There are two factors getting in the way. These two factors prohibit us from making this fundamental examination of our defense posture. One of those factors is called commitments. We have, as they exist now, defense treaties with some forty-three different nations in the world. As Secretary Kissinger has pointed out, we have informal commitments to several dozen more. When it boils down to commitments, either formal or informal, we have something like commitments to two-thirds of the nations of the world.

You would have thought after Vietnam that we would be out of that kind of business. But it is quite clear that we are not! And it is quite clear that the policy in Washington is not to be out of that business. Every time an issue arises, like Angola for example, people say, "Oh, this is not another Vietnam. Don't worry. You can go ahead and vote to send arms there because this is not another Vietnam." But it *is* another Vietnam in the sense that the same kind of mentality which got us into Vietnam is the same kind of mentality that we are talking about here.

The really fundamental question that we have to ask is how do we get back out of these unrealistic, unimportant, and potentially very dangerous commitments? Once we have made that decision it is more than just a slogan to say that we are no longer going to be the policemen of the world. Even people who say they favor sending military equipment to Angola say that we won't be policemen of the world. So, "we won't be policemen of the world" has become an elastic phrase that covers everything. It has no meaning. How are we going to really get to the point where we *really are not* the policemen of the world?

Then, how do we get ourselves out of those commitments we have got ourselves into? That is a difficult question because somehow it is never the right time to get out. About seventy percent of our military budget goes to maintaining those kinds of commitments, goes to military forces connected with those commitments. Somehow, we are still involved with commitments as if Vietnam had never occurred.

I don't know which commitments the American public would support and which not. I am sure that all Americans feel some kind of commitment to Europe, Japan, and the Middle East. But all these others—sixty-six countries—do we want commitments to two-thirds of the countries of the world? That is the question that is getting in the way of fundamental reappraisal of our defense posture.

The second thing which gets in the way of answering "How much is enough?" is that we have come to a point where we must examine our belief in the utility of military power. There are a lot of casual assumptions about the utility—the use of military power—which are being made. Obviously, any country that possesses a

great amount of military power can get away with certain kinds of situations. That, as we have seen in the United States, is not always the case.

In the 1950s, for example, we had enormous military power. We had a monopoly on nuclear weapons. What did we find? We found in Korea that it didn't automatically mean that because we had total destructive military power that we could get our way. Once again in Vietnam, we learned something about the limitations of military power when we tried to impose political will upon the political will of that country. There are certain kinds of situations that won't budge just because one side has more military power. More recently, the OPEC countries have given us another reminder that there are some things in which military power is absolutely no help at all. Yet, we still continue to assume that military power has some utility.

We read in the paper and hear a lot of talk about how the U.S. is becoming more and more dependent upon foreign sources for raw materials. Or, we hear that there is great political unrest in Italy and other European countries which are considered our allies, as if this is somehow an argument for more military power! When you stop to think about it, military power isn't very useful in those kinds of situations. To use military force in these kinds of situations might actually be counterproductive.

So, the point to emphasize is that national security is not just a military problem. There are limitations on those kinds of things that military power can do and national security is not necessarily tied up with military power.

I am not in the habit of quoting the Bible to make a point. However, the situation calls for a quote here, a favorite quote of former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Schlesinger. He would say, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." It is from Proverbs 29:19. It is a Proverb that is worth reading in full because the vision that the prophet is talknig about is not the vision of a nation that has enough nuclear power to destroy its enemies several times over and, yet, it continues to build more. It is not the vision of a nation that persists in its attempt to exert its might among the nations of this world even after it has discovered that such an attempt is destined to bring ruin to itself and to others. It is, if you read the Proverb, a vision of a just society, a society in which men and women respect each other and live in peace with each other. It is a society which is strong because it has provided—as we might put it today—a true national security.

CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIVE—1976

John G. Tower

My fellow Americans, it is a great pleasure to be here this evening. I am rather flattered that you would ask me to address you, for several reasons. First, I am both the son and grandson of Methodist clergymen. I noticed that part of my background was carefully omitted by the man who introduced me. And, of course, being a Texan, I understand that we always have a bit of a credibility problem.

In this Bicentennial year, as you reflect back on the history of your country, you might recall that bit of history about the time when George Washington was a little boy living with his father on their ranch in West Texas. George's father had a mesquite tree that he loved very much. It wasn't just because of the beautiful foliage of that mesquite tree; it was the only tree in a fifty-mile radius. (That was before the mesquite took over the place.) One day while George's father was out riding the open range and rounding up a few mavericks to brand for his own herd, George took the new Bowie knife that he had gotten for Christmas and he whittled that tree to the ground. That evening his father came home tired and dusty, climbed off his horse, and went out in the backyard to look at his tree, and there it was on the ground. So, he summoned his son, George, to him and said: "George, you know I loved that tree. Can you tell me who cut it down?" George looked his father squarely in the eye, and said, "Father, I did it. I cannot tell a lie." George's father sighed and put his hat back on and said, "Son, pack your stuff. We're going to move to Virginia. You'll never get along in Texas that way." So, I know I have the credibility gap to overcome, but not only that, I am also precisely one foot below the legal, minimum size for Texans.

Being a Republican and a Methodist among a bunch of Baptists, I feel like one lion in a den full of Daniels.

You have assigned me the topic of "Conscience of a Conservative—1976" which is a plagiarism on the title of a book, *The Conscience of a Conservative,* written some fifteen or sixteen years ago by my colleague, Barry Goldwater. I am sure if Barry knew that I was speaking on his topic, he would be very upset. He seldom gets around Baptist gatherings, so he probably will not know about this. Indeed, I don't think he would be admitted!

I think I can begin by saying the conscience of a conservative in 1976 is the same conscience, in my view, as that possessed by the founding fathers of this country in 1776. They would not have called themselves conservatives in those days. As a matter of fact, they might have been viewed by some as a bit radical. The term "liberal" in the classical definition probably better applies both to the ideas that they expressed and to the ideas that I believe I cling to. The fact of the matter is that it was a conscience that was steeped in the Judeo-Christian ethic and one that had come to accept Anglo-Saxon theories of law and right that had evolved over a period of many years in England and which were beginning to take shape and form even at the time Columbus discovered America.

We believe in the preservation of existing institutions because they are rooted in the Christian ethic and because they are rooted in Anglo-Saxon concepts of that which is just, because they are rooted in the deep-seated convictions concerning the value of individuals. Those of us who call ourselves conservatives believe in maximum individual liberty and freedom of choice and we believe in the preservation of those institutions that give us that liberty and that freedom of choice. That is not to say we reject change. Indeed, we welcome change, and change is the continuing order of things.

For my part, I don't want to go back to the "good old days," when I worked on a sandy land farm in East Texas and had to use a coal oil lamp at night and

walked a hundred feet outdoors at night if there was something compelling for me to do. I don't want the "good old days," when I saw my grandmother old before her time, having borne fifteen children, having never seen a labor-saving device in the kitchen. No, I think that change should be accepted as the order of things. Without change, we stagnate. But in the process of welcoming change, we must preserve the institutions that have given us the freedom and the dynamism to effect change.

The free political and legal climate that we have in this country and, beyond that, the free economic institutions that we have, have produced the genius that has brought about change, that has operated for the betterment of mankind. But we must understand that the amassing of a great, sophisticated technology will net us nothing but ultimate pain and death if we do not preserve the institutions in our society that have given us a conscience, that have given us a standard of morality, that have given us a concern for and respect for the rights and privileges of our fellowman. We could lose these institutions and they could be eroded away, gradually.

Today, I think the greatest enemy of freedom, the greatest enemy of liberty, is the steady growth of big government, the increasing inclination toward the layering on of more government-sponsored Big Brotherism. I suppose there are two ways that a Christian may look at things in terms of government's role in society and reasonable men may differ. I think it is just as Christian to insist that we do certain things for ourselves or that we, in an institutional sense as Baptists or Methodists or whatever we might be, do things for our fellowman rather than insist that government do it all. I think that really big government can potentially be an anathema to true religion. Too often too many Christians want to abdicate their responsibilities as individual Christians by insisting that the government pass yet another social or economic program and impose it on the people in order to relieve the collective consciences of everybody. Big government has within the lifetime of even the youngest among you here steadily eroded away your freedom. You have less individual liberty and freedom of choice. Much of this is done in the name of protecting you from big business, or from the farmer, or from the shopkeeper. Much of it has been done in the name of providing a higher quality of life for those who are socially and economically disadvantaged. Much of it has come about because people even as conservative as I am have supported these programs because they look pretty good standing on their own merit. We have never considered in the Congress, I'm afraid, in the past recent years at least, the aggregate impact of what we do and how it influences the daily lives of you all. There are many examples of it.

Of course, there are some kinds of Big Brotherism that are more apparent than others. I do not imagine there is anybody here who, had he not been a Baptist, would not have cursed the interlocking seatbelt device in the automobile, that, for a couple of years, compelled us to get harnessed up before we could even start the car. Now, that is the government saying, "You are really too dumb to look to your own safety. Therefore, we must insist that we do it for you." And, of course, the people rebelled against that. They wrote letters to their Congressmen and finally the Congress passed a law making these things optional, saying you cannot require them any more because we got a public reaction.

But there are other ways the government impacts on you that are far more subtle. You do not understand because you do not perceive it. Perhaps you are not aware of how much more you pay for goods and services because of certain consumer protection requirements, environmental protection requirements, occupational safety and health act requirements, equal employment opportunity requirements, deducting taxes for the government and doing their bookkeeping for them—all of these things add to the cost of goods and services.

Now, there is proposed a Consumer Protection Agency that has three premises: One is that the businessmen are crooked and out to bilk the public. Number two is that consumers are stupid and gullible. And number three is that government is infallible. And none of these three, I submit to you, are true. So my conscience compels me to suggest to you that our free institutions are worth preserving. But they are gradually being eroded away. Don't think just in terms of how you are politically and legally protected. We all believe in our system of equality in the eyes of the law because that tracks with our conviction as Christians that we are all equal in the eyes of God. We believe in citizen participation in the political process because in the final analysis it must be responsible to those whom it governs, and that is consistent with our tradition.

We should not take for granted economic freedom which is also an essential part of our liberty because as you spend a dollar in the marketplace you are casting a ballot to determine what goods and services are going to be produced. That is just as much a ballot as the one you cast on election day. It is one you cast more frequently, so it has more continuing impact on what goes on.

The more the government takes away from you in taxes and the more the government prescribes what is going to be produced, or not produced, or what shall be regulated and allocated in terms of supply, then the less freedom you have. Economic freedom is an essential part of total freedom. Although I come to you as a conservative, I do not come as a moss-backed reactionary. We must make progress; we must accept change; and we must maintain the essential American qualities of self-analysis and self-criticism. We must right injustice as we see it occur. There is still injustice abroad in our land, there is still prejudice. But, in doing so, we should not so engage in an orgy of self-recrimination and self-destruction as Americans that we fail to see what our basic strengths are. We should not be so busy beating our breasts and shouting *mea culpa* that we fail to see how strong we really are, how worthwhile most things in our society really are, and how honest most of our businessmen, politicians, workers, clergymen, and lawyers really are. It is as dangerous, I think, for us to underestimate our strengths and overestimate our weaknesses as it is to do it the other way around.

So I think we need some balance in our society these days. We must maintain our concern balanced by a healthy respect for the institutions that have developed in this country for over 350 years and which

have become a part of our body politic for the last 200 years. In this Bicentennial year, I hope there can be a lot of reflection on what is good for America.

Slightly more than 200 years ago, some farmers on a village green in New England fired the shot heard around the world and that shot is still ricocheting across the latitudes of time and space. Free men everywhere and men who yearn to be free still listen with awe to its sound. Only our flagging will and our own moral exhaustion will silence it.

THE BLACK EXPERIENCE—1976

Andrew Young

The black experience in 1976 is strangely one of frustration. It is one of frustration because we are not sure where we have come and we are not sure that the progress we see in some areas is not being undone in other areas. There is a strange ambiguity about this period in which we live. We are surrounded by tremendous victories and at the same time, agonizing problems of poverty, lack of education, and the lack of job opportunities still engulf us.

I would like to take you back just a little way to kind of catch us up on how we got to this point, because I think that a little historical perspective gives us an understanding of why we are now confused. I start this period twenty years ago with Martin Luther King in Montgomery, Alabama. That was also a year after the Supreme Court plunged our Southland into a terrible confusion over the question of race. Yet, from 1955 on, under the leadership of Martin Luther King, the South decided largely through its black citizens that it was going to take a route of change without violence. In some strange way, it was the Christian heritage in the black community that gave the sense of direction and also the meaning and the purpose to that Civil Rights movement. I don't think we could have had a movement led by a preacher in my church, the United Church of Christ. We couldn't have had a movement led by an Episcopalian. It had to be a Baptist preacher because there was no other church that was free enough to follow where the Spirit was leading in those days. There was also no other church that had the depth of rootage in the black community. Martin Luther King, Jr. was not an accident. He was the child of Martin Luther King, Sr., who was the son-in-law of A. D. Williams: three generations of nationally known, prominent, evangelical Baptist preachers. Daddy King had been preaching revivals from one end of this country to the other, as had Martin's grandfather. So anywhere he went, he was accepted because they knew that M. L.'s boy was all right. And that is the way things happened. It was not an organization; it was a movement. It came out of that Christian experience—a black Christian experience—yes, but an experience not alienated from the experience which our white brothers have had with Christ. In fact, I insist that a part of our response—a good part of our response—was that we were operating in the midst of a society that was far more Christian than any of its pastors could ever admit or preach about. The hearts of the people in the pews were way ahead of the laws of the land. One of the reasons why we have seen such dramatic changes in the South is that generations of preaching had prepared the South for a community of justice. There was a warm, loving spirit which prevailed between individuals so that when the laws were broken down, the basic decency of folk just asserted itself, and we were able to have change.

That was a dramatic change. It was a dramatic change in 1960 when in one year, some 200 cities desegregated lunch counters. It was a dramatic change a few years later when in 1964 a Civil Rights Act was passed which desegregated all public accommodations in the South. Then another year later came the Voting Rights Act which gave the right to vote. We could almost see the gospel being fulfilled, those of us who had been preaching that kind of incarnation of the gospel into the life of the community.

One of my favorite stories is the one when you had no black folk registered in the South, you got elected by "out-niggering" your opponent. Then when you got fifteen percent or so folk registered in the black community, the politicians said "négro." When you got the registration up to about thirty-five or forty percent, it was amazing how quickly you learned how to say "negró." And when you got about sixty or sixty-five percent registered, every politician in the South was proud to be associated with his "black brother." It sort of demonstrates a kind of age-old prophecy of Frederick Douglass a hundred years before, which said that the struggle of freedom in America is the struggle to save "black men's bodies" and "white men's souls." In fact, as we fought for our freedom and liberation, we brought a kind of freedom to the nation as a whole and created a coalition of goodwill which was a coalition of blacks and young people and women largely operating around the religious community. The liberal community and the labor movement were all a part of it. But the church was far more central in that struggle than I think any historian has ever stopped to write down or to understand.

So, we saw a nation begin to move forward out of a kind of coalition of goodwill that was beginning to do justice in our land. We understood our role as ministers to preach good news to the poor, release to the captives, sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who were oppressed. And we saw that as something that in a democratic society had to take place in the context of the political order. So, that was the reason why in the black church there was no problem mixing religion and politics. In fact, the problem is how do you separate them. When I was pastoring a little country church, I thought I could really preach, but my members would still go out and get drunk on Fridays. Oh, I did everything. I preached and I counseled and I organized groups, and finally I just decided that the problem was that here were men and women to whom God had given tremendous potential and they were working for $35 and $45 a week. They would come home knowing they didn't have enough to make ends meet. They would stop off on the way and drink up some of that before they got home. You know, you could almost see it. Maids in those days got from $5 to $10 a week. The hostilities from the system that treated them like something less than God's children so disrupted their own family lives that it set in motion a pattern of violence

that made people destroy themselves through drinking and attempt to destroy each other in an expression of their frustrations. I couldn't preach about that. I couldn't just help them understand that. Somehow my ministry had to involve them in getting a job which allowed them to utilize their potential. Somehow my ministry had to involve their registering to vote so that they might really be full-fledged citizens of the community in which they lived and where they might be respected by all of the leadership, whether it be black or white.

And we have begun to see that sort of thing happen across the South. I tell you, I am amazed when I go back to Greene County, Alabama, where in 1965, people were beating up people on the courthouse steps to try to keep them from voting; and now the only nonviolent sheriff in America, maybe, is the sheriff of Greene County. He is the young minister who was on the SCLC staff as an organizer in 1967 and he is the sheriff of a county now. The board of education reflects the black majority of that county, as does the county commission. And they are now thinking of themselves and acting as though they were God's children because somehow the society has made it possible for them to take charge of their own destiny and to work with their brethren to solve the problems of their community. They are doing a lot better than anybody has ever done before, because nobody has ever before really tried to represent everybody.

Or look at the city of Atlanta, and see the miraculous changes. It almost brings tears to my eyes to see how that city blooms, especially in the springtime when all the dogwoods are out and the combination of the dogwoods and those gigantic skyscrapers are looming up, and to see the beautiful people who have come there to live together in a new kind of freedom and understanding and love for one another. Not that we don't still fight, not that there aren't real disagreements, but they are disagreements within a family and we know that nobody is really going anywhere. We might complain about things as they are, but we know that they are better than they ever have been, and we know we are going to stay there and try to make them even better.

All of that is the legacy of that Civil Rights movement of the '60s. I could go on and on about that legacy, no small part of which I think is embodied in my being in the Congress of the United States. Eleven years ago, marching from Selma to Montgomery in the mud, I never thought I would get this far. It never dawned on me that I would run for Congress, much less be a member of Congress. Yet, while all of that has happened, still we saw this nation move through a period of tremendous social change, move into a period of political progress, and then come to the threshold of the economic question and flounder. That is what really began to happen in 1965: the progress we were making socially and politically got way ahead of the economic progress. In fact, the progress we made in the South didn't cost anybody anything. It made money. Rich's is a whole lot better off now than during segregation. If you know Atlanta, you know Rich's. People began moving from the rural Southland into the cities as the technological changes came to the South. They were people from the age-old heritage of segregation, the generations of neglect of the black children and the white children as well, who were used on the farms to make our land agriculturally prosperous and who went to school when they weren't needed in the fields. Those were the people who began moving into our cities. The problems which we now face in our cities are economic problems; they are urban problems, problems of urbanization, but they all seem to be race problems. But they are *not really* race problems.

My wife was a reading teacher in the public school system of Atlanta. She was in charge of an area that was a really poor area where they did have integrated living and integrated schools. One of the first things that she began to recognize was that the reading difficulties of poor white children coming into the city from the rural South were almost identical to the reading difficulties of the poor black children. Something was happening there that public education had not adjusted to. It was not so much that black children couldn't read or couldn't learn or that white children from the rural areas were socially or mentally retarded; it was basically that we had a school system that was not designed to meet their needs. So we began to get into all kinds of complications as a result of this. We no longer saw the real problem but we began to deal with the symptoms of the problem.

Now something else happened about 1965, and that is that we got involved in the war in Vietnam. Between about 1965 and 1971, we spent $150 billion on death and destruction. We preachers ought to take seriously what we say when we take up the collection, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust corrupteth, and where thieves break through and steal. . . . For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (Matt. 6:19, 21). For a decade almost, our treasure was in death and destruction in this nation. The heart of this nation suffered terribly as a result of the moral dilemma in which we found ourselves. We distorted our values. We could not face the truth. We could not for a long time admit how wrong it was. The moral disintegration that came to this nation as a result of our involvement in Vietnam, I think is still very much with us. On the race question alone, we have not had a moral statement since Lyndon Johnson's "We Shall Overcome" speech in 1965. No other president since then has ever tried to point the American people to the high road of brotherhood. Rather, instead, we have had a Southern strategy, an attempt to divide and conquer, a play on the emotions and weaknesses of people about busing, a use of code words like "welfare chiselers," and "food stamp hustlers." And even in the calamity surrounding New York, there was a strange way in which the problem of New York was the problem, not of an urban society which had tried to educate its people, which had tried to provide hospitals and health care, which had tried to deal with the tired and poor and weak from all over the world—but the problem of the whole country because of our involvement in the war in Vietnam and the subsequent damage to our national economy.

We couldn't even look at the problem of New York in the Congress of the United States without one Congressman finally saying, "New York is not for my folk—New York is Jews, foreigners, Puerto Ricans, and blacks. And we could care less." But that attitude of the American people was not the natural attitude of the American people. That was a contrived attitude which was brought on by the way in which the national lead-

ership pandered to the weakness and moral confusion of the nation.

Right about that time, I ran across a passage in the book of Proverbs (17:5, RSV) while I was looking for something to preach about the following Sunday. "He who mocks the poor insults his Maker; he who is glad at calamity will not go unpunished." And I began to see the problem that we as a nation now have, not as a result of bad people but as a result of no moral leadership. We became so involved in trying to defend the wrong thing that we were doing at home and abroad that we could not do the right thing that we should have been doing. So we have unemployment running about ten percent across the nation, but in the black community, it is closer to twenty percent. In our big cities amongst the young, sixteen percent to twenty-five percent are unemployed. In Chicago on the West Side, unemployment runs about twenty-five percent. How can you tell a man or a boy that he is God's child if the society has no place for him? That is the problem we face right now. We face the problem of having come a long, long way, but when it came time to deal with the tough issues, the issues that cost money, the money we needed to spend on those issues at home and abroad, we had already used it up in death and destruction in Vietnam.

I used to look at our national economy from very partisan eyes; please forgive me. If you are Southern Baptists, you are from Democrat country. Maybe there are a few Republicans here, but forgive me anyway. I think of the story of Joseph and the seven years of plenty and the seven years of famine in Egypt, and that's the way it seems and that's the reason I saw us with seven good years from 1960 to roughly 1967. But along with the war in Vietnam also came the politics of assassination. The good people that would have been giving us national leadership of a high moral caliber were killed. The people internationally that were leading us in a creative direction of world brotherhood were killed. Much of it was acknowledged as assassination by mysterious, unknown, and evil forces. Others seem to be a result of accidents. Dick Gregory says if you have been around this country and been involved in as much as we have, if you are not kind of paranoid, you are really sick! So I began to think of it all as one gigantic conspiracy. Yet I hope that now we have gone through it. In some strange way again, the black community which was moving toward the redemption of the nation in the Civil Rights movement in the '60s was in another way responsible for the redemption of the nation surrounding Watergate. It was one of those lazy, shiftless, no-account black men who was supposed to be asleep on the job who caught them trying to walk away with the nation!

But it is an even deeper story than that. The black community always understood Watergate. I remember I was pulling out of a parking lot out here in Washington, and a parking lot attendant saw the Congressional sticker on my windshield and he stuck his head in and said, "Boy, are you a Congressman?" I said, "Yes, sir!" And he said, "Do you know about this Watergate mess?" I said, "Yes, sure." And he said, "I'm not talking about what you read in the papers. I'm saying do you *really* know about the mess?" And I knew I was in for it then, but this was long before the firing of Cox and the Saturday Night Massacre. This was long before the *Washington Post* had begun to unearth the complexities and involvements surrounding Watergate. But a black parking lot attendant in this town understood it all.

Look at what happened in the Congress of the United States. I think one of the few Congressional chairmen secure enough to deal with a problem so delicate as Watergate and not suffer a tremendous backlash from his own district was Peter Rodino from Newark, a district that is sixty-five percent black. Because the black community understood what Watergate was about, Peter Rodino, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was very secure and could proceed with an investigation and let justice find its own way. But also on that Committee were three black Congresspersons: Charlie Rangel of Harlem, John Conyers of Detroit, and Barbara Jordan of Houston, Texas. Somebody said that Barbara Jordan that night on television had everybody ready to believe that God had to be a black woman! She spoke with such moral authority and with such conviction that there was no way to escape the problem there.

But people were telling me that the old coalition of conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats would reassert itself, and that the Judiciary Committee would never vote an impeachment resolution. What they didn't realize was that the 1965 Civil Rights Act had made it possible for men like Ray Thornton of Arkansas or Walter Flowers from the Black belt of Alabama, or Jim Mann from South Carolina really to vote their consciences. That coalition of forces coming out of that same Civil Rights movement and continuing to work silently in spite of the fact that the national leadership is moving in another direction or in no direction at all, has kind of brought us back to a time where the things that we worked for and dreamed about in the '60s, which were frustrated by and floundered because of assassinations, Vietnam, and mediocrity in the highest places, now in 1976 we have an opportunity to do something about.

But there again is another confusion, for we started out thinking of these as black problems. Now we realize that they are not black problems; they are everybody's problems. Unemployment is not just a black problem. Yes, blacks suffer from it twice as much as whites. But unemployment is a problem of the whole nation. It is a problem that affects not only the unemployed. In fact, the unemployed may not be nearly as affected as those of us who have jobs and who find ourselves taxed through inflation to pay for the cost of the survival of the unemployed. Health insurance is not just a black problem. It is a serious problem for the newly arriving black community: People who have worked and saved their money and finally settled down in homes as one of my constituents had, where both husband and wife had worked for ten years to buy a home in a comfortable suburb. Then the wife had a baby and the child was stillborn and the hospital expenses were so great that it not only took all of their savings but they had to borrow money to get her out of the hospital. They fell three months behind on the house note and were on the verge of losing their home. No, that is not a black problem. That is a hospital costing $200 a day in Washington, D. C., projected by estimates to go up to $450 a day in the next four years. But that is everybody's problem. Some kind of change in the health care

delivery system is a crisis for America. So black folk are confused because we thought we were the only ones bad off. Now we find that everybody else is sort of coming on to our turf and joining in our problems with us. And a lot of folk resent that. They resent the fact that the candidates are not talking about black issues because the black issues are the white issues. If you are going to talk to people, you talk to people about the problems. And while blacks identify with them, they are looking for somebody to say something special to black folk. There is almost not much special to be said.

That hospital thing is really disastrous. Our first child was born down in Thomasville, Georgia and it cost $32. My wife stayed in the hospital two and one-half days, natural childbirth, no complications. I gave a $50 deposit and got $18 back. My younger brother's wife had a baby last week, natural childbirth, no complications, two and one-half days in the hospital in Atlanta, and the bill was $863. You know, that is a crisis.

So the problems and the black experience in '76 are very closely bound with the experience of other Americans. I would even say in the area of busing that Boston would not be so bad if they had not closed the Boston Navy Yard and if the level of unemployment in that Irish ghetto were no so high. We didn't have problems in Atlanta, and Atlanta used to brag about being a city too busy to hate. Whenever they got to feeling very virtuous, I reminded them that they were a city too busy to hate because they were too busy making money. But you let us come upon hard times in Atlanta and it will be amazing how petty many of those same good people would become.

Now I think what we see across the nation is not primarily a racial crisis, but a moral crisis, a leadership crisis, an economic crisis. Many times it takes racial overtones. We are trying to deal with new food stamp legislation now and it is hard to deal with because people have somehow been led to believe that large numbers of people are ripping off the food stamps. Yet any detailed study of the food stamp program indicates that its error rate is probably minimal when it is compared with the error rate in income taxes or any other federal program. The total cost of the food stamp program is about $6.9 billion, and there are about $20 billion in uncollected income taxes by the estimates of IRS themselves. That doesn't mean that is all that people are getting away with, because of the unjust loopholes which still exist in our tax system. So this becomes a time when we have to take on some of these hard issues.

I would hope that certainly a people who have come up following the teachings of a Lord who said that "For I was hungry, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink. . . . Inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me" (Matt. 25:42, 45); I would hope that we would be actively engaged in support of decent food stamp legislation so that there need be nobody hungry in this nation. There is certainly a high moral priority on feeding the hungry. Even if we have no moral priority, I think the reason why we did not have the violence and upheavals in the last few years that we had in the late '60s, in spite of the fact that unemployment and other condtions were perhaps worse for poor people, was because in the '60s we did set in motion certain survival progams like food stamps, Medicare and Medicaid, so that people, even though they were unemployed, even though they were in trouble, even though times were hard, did at least know where their next meal was coming from. I think that maybe $7 billion was certainly a very good investment in a healthy, civilized, moral society.

Let me go abroad for a minute. Somehow the black experiences have a foreign component which you, as missionary-minded people, will have to share. The foreign policy of our nation and the attention of our nation's policies have drifted toward Africa. Whether you realize it or not, we started all of that over there. The Communists didn't start what is going on in Angola. Every leader, every Angolan movement was the product of Christian missionary schools. The father of Holden Roberto of the FNLA was a Baptist preacher. The father of Augustino Neto, the leader of the Soviet-backed MPLA, was a Presbyterian preacher. Don't make too much out of that! The father of Jonas Savimbi of the UNITA Movement of the South, was a preacher in the United Church of Christ. You go to Zambia and Kenneth Kaunda is the son of a Presbyterian preacher. You go to Tanzania and Julius Nyereie is the product of the Roman Catholic mission in that country. All over Africa, the leadership that is responsible for the liberation movements and the emerging of new nations learned they were free when somebody put a New Testament in their hands and told them they were God's children. And that is very potent stuff.

What happened was that our foreign policy doesn't understand that. Kissinger is sure that these are people who cannot be trusted, that they will be manipulated by the Russians or the Cubans or somebody. And that is a racist assumption itself. But if he understood the missionary origins of their desire for freedom, he would understand that there is a relationship possible between the United States and almost any country in Africa that is very hard for Communists to undo. Somehow that has to get into the thinking and the direction of this nation's policies. In fact, we have to complete the revolution that we started. We can't walk away from it and leave our Christian brothers at the mercy of the Russians and the Cubans. There is a continuing Christian responsibility.

I was in Kenya not long ago and went into a home and there were three pictures on the wall of this young district officer. There was a picture of Jesus Christ set high in the middle, and Jomo Kenyatta on one side and Mark Hatfield on the other. I asked him about this. He said, "I was a student in Oregon when Mark Hatfield was governor. I never met him but once, but I saw in him a kind of dedicated servant of people and I wanted to be that kind of person when I came back to my country." Now it takes a long time to undo that, because he had a good experience for about six years of study in the United States. I have never met an African yet who had a good experience studying in Russia. For very good reasons, there are no black people in Russia. And because they have had almost no experience in dealing with cultural differences, Russia is probably more racist than we are in this country. And bad as we are, we may be the best people in the world! If that is so, then a great deal is required of us for "Everyone

to whom much is given, of him will much be required" (Luke 12:48, RSV).

So I see this black experience in 1976 as being also a Christian experience in 1976. I see it as being a kind of emergence of a new Bicentennial spirit. I see this as an opportunity to pick up the mantle of progress, of economic justice, of world peace and brotherhood, of a new understanding between ourselves and each other. I can see this as an opportunity to move forward in a way that even now we can't yet imagine. You know, through all of this struggle, all the '60s, I think the thing that kept hope alive was the faith of our fathers. The amazing thing to me is that even in slavery, black men and women dug deep down into the biblical tradition and they came forth with a hope when there seemed to be nothing in which to hope.

I have always been amazed how people could come in from the fields after working as slaves all day and eating out of troughs of slop and could sit down and write a song like:

Over my head I see freedom in the air,
There must be a God somewhere!

This was more visionary than the Prophet Jeremiah, for when Jeremiah looked at his people in exile and in slavery, he asked God a question, "Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there?" (8:22). But somehow black men and women straightened out Jeremiah's question mark into an exclamation point and when they wrote their song, they said:

Yes, there is a balm in Gilead
That makes the wounded whole,
There is a balm in Gilead
That heals the sin-sick soul; so
When I get discouraged and think
my work's in vain,
Then comes the Holy Spirit to
revive my soul again!

That is the black experience; that is the American experience, because though other people might put it in different language, the American experience is an experience of hope. There is nobody that came to this country having it made. Everybody came here seeking something—religious freedom, political freedom, economic security. Somehow here we found it. You look back through the hymns of our churches and you realize that something wonderful has been happening here. We do get discouraged that it doesn't go at the pace that we want it to go. We forget that it is by the blood of the martyrs that the church's seed is fertilized, and flourishes. We forget that there is a cross also in our heritage and that there may be no remission of sins without the shedding of innocent blood.

And the tragedy and the horror of our times is also the opportunity of our times. I think we are coming to a period when all of these things must begin to come into focus. If we as the black people have had something to do with it, it is because the white people shared their understanding of God. If we can export that understanding of God to other black, brown, yellow peoples of the world, maybe not in our own language, maybe not in the same symbols we use, but if somehow the corporate and technological structure of this nation can be marshalled to feed the hungry of the world, there might be peace on earth. The tensions that have existed between blacks and whites in this country are inevitably giving way to a tension between the have's and the have-not's. But in Alvin Toffler's words in *Future Shock*, he puts it even different from that: "It may not even be a tension between the have's and the have-not's, but maybe the biggest dividing line in the future of mankind is the division between those who live for themselves and those who are willing to live for others." That is in the language of a sociologist, but I think that is also in the spirit of the New Testament. So I hope that out of your experience here with us, that you would move on into our third century of freedom in this nation and make it really a century of economic justice for the poor at home and abroad, that we would begin to heal the divisions between rural and urban and suburban, that the tensions between the young and old might find some new reconciliation, and that there might be something on this earth that begins a little more to reflect what we have understood to be God's Kingdom.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENS CONFRONTING CIVIL RELIGION

Mark Hatfield

I am anxious to share with you this morning and I want to tell you what a great privilege it is to be invited to participate in this very significant series of discussions. I am most impressed by the wide range of subject material which is being covered by the very outstanding individuals that you have chosen. I do want to say that I am wrestling with this subject. I am not standing here this morning as an expert in civil religion but I am very concerned about the issue and would like to share where I am, at least at this moment in my life, in the evolution of this subject matter.

I think one of the most tragic figures in the Old Testament was King Uzziah. You recall that he was crowned the King of Judah at the age of sixteen and lived to reign for many, many years. In fact, he restored some of the greatness that was once the kingdom of Israel and had been lost since Solomon's reign 200 years before. We read in 2 Chronicles (26:16) this particular description: "But when he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction: for he transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense." God's instruction had been very clear that only the members of the family of Aaron should take on themselves these religious duties and privileges. God's judgment was swift and was dramatic, because you recall that Uzziah was stricken with leprosy and remained an outcast until his death. We could say that the sin of Uzziah has been repeated by rulers and nations many times since, the sin of using religion to legitimatize political leadership. It is the sin of making the authority and power of the state absolute and supreme, even above our loyalty to God's laws and God's instructions.

This phenomenon has been called civil religion, borrowing the phrase from Jean Jacques Rousseau's dissertation called "The Social Contract." One element of our civil religion today is our ceremonial Christianity

which is relatively harmless, for example, the phrase on our coins, "In God We Trust"; in our Pledge of Allegiance, "one nation under God"; the statements of our founding fathers that are used frequently and even of our leaders today. But the more dangerous aspects of civil religion are the tendencies to claim God's blessings and ratification upon the state and to assume that loyalty to God always means total loyalty to the state. We have transposed the Old Testament model of a theocracy into modern life and are trying to put God on the throne of our land instead of on the throne of our lives. We have stood by frequently while rulers have offered incense and have assumed God was blessing since his judgment was not immediate, as in the case of King Uzziah.

The only effective antidote to the uncritical patriotism of this Bicentennial year is to return to the Scripture and to find in its pages the intended relationship of the believer of the state. The Old Testament prophets were sent by God to present a clear witness to those in power. They challenged the readiness of the people to place their primary trust in earthly power instead of God. They proclaimed God's judgment on Israel for falling into the practices of the heathen political systems, of perpetuating economic injustice, overlooking the needs of the poor, the defenseless, the oppressed. The Old Testament message of judgment and repentance looked forward to the Messiah, the Suffering Servant.

We do not do justice to Christ's ministry if we treat it with anything less than its fullest dimensions. On the one hand, Christ firmly resisted the efforts of those who wanted his ministry to be exclusively political. He made it clear that his kingdom was not of this world; that is, it was greater than any human political system and cause. At the same time, Christ's witness spoke powerfully to the political, the social, the economic tensions of that age and to ours. If you recall, Jesus was born at a time and in a land that was torn by political unrest. Small wonder, then, that some who learned that Jesus was the Messiah mistakenly thought his deliverance was to be exclusively political and military.

If Christ had undertaken to deliver the Jewish people from Roman rule, he would have had the enthusiastic support of the Zealots. You recall that the Zealots felt that cooperation with Caesar was totally contrary to their loyalty to Yahweh. Consequently they felt justified in using violence not only against the Romans but also against the Israelites who collaborated with the enemy. Jesus had extensive contacts with the Zealots. In fact, some of his disciples were sympathetic to the movement. The Zealots found encouragement in Jesus' expulsion of the business interests from the Temple, when Jesus referred to Herod as a fox, and his words about the oppression of human rulers. But Christ refused to accept the methods put forward by the Zealots. He knew that the fulfillment of God's promises to his people did not lie in violent expulsion of the Romans and the restoration of the Jewish theocracy.

Having rejected the pathway to violent revolution, Christ might have gone to the other extreme and advocated the complete separation of religious convictions from public life, as did the Pharisees. The Pharisees concentrated their efforts on the rigid observance of the law. They had some misgivings about Roman rule but their myopic concentration on religiosity left little room for social consciousness and prophetic vision. Christ rebuked the Pharisees in very strong terms for their hypocrisy, for their compartmentalizing of their religion from the rest of their life. Christ condemned them for going through the motions of almsgiving while overlooking justice, mercy, and faith. He rejected the "either-or" mentality, for he said, "These you ought to have done, without neglecting the others" (Matt. 23:23, RSV). In other words, sensitivity to social and political issues is a logical corollary, not a substitute for worship and personal spirituality.

Christ rejected still another political force—the total cooperation with Roman rule as practiced by the Sadducees. In exchange for collaborating with and blessing the political regime, the Sadducees received the support of Roman authorities for their religious undertakings. The Sadducees simply set aside any Messianic hope for God's kingdom in order to deal, as they said, "realistically" with the power situation of their day as they faced it. To the Sadducees and their modern counterparts Christ made it clear that complete loyalty to the existing order was incompatible with the kingdom of God and its demands. He invited the tax collectors like Matthew to follow him, but he expected them to leave behind their involvement with the injustice of Roman power.

To the Sadducees, Christ offered something akin to the social critique of the Zealots without its violent methods. We read that throughout Christ's life and his ministry he dealt with the political authorities and taught his followers about the relevance of faith to the state. Christ used a question of paying taxes to Rome to help define the boundaries between the spiritual and political loyalties. When the Pharisees asked him if they should pay Roman taxes, he simply said, "Pay Caesar what is due to Caesar, and pay God what is due to God" (Matt. 22:21, NEB). He turned what was intended as a trap into an opportunity to teach. He was saying that there are legitimate obligations which governments can ask of their citizens, but there are distinct limits to these demands.

Shortly after the encounter on the question of taxes, Jesus said, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment" (Matt. 22:37-38, RSV). It comes first. Clearly he was describing a universal obligation which might at times supercede the duties to Caesar.

Our heresy today, my friends, is in pretending that the spheres of loyalty to God and Caesar are separate and equal. It is clear that the devoted follower of God cannot isolate the political portions of their ideas and activities from his all-encompassing loyalty to Christ. One of the great discourses of Christ recorded in Matthew was on the parable of the kingdom of God. He used the parable of the Ten Virgins and the Ten Talents to illustrate the importance of making oneself ready on a personal level for God's kingdom. Then he went on to describe the judgment day when he himself would judge the world. Since he had been talking about a kingdom, some were ready for him to indicate that judgment day rewards go to the powerful, those who had learned to work within the political system; instead, though, he promised rewards to those who had served, not those who had exercised power. "Come, O blessed of my Father," he said, "inherit the

kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me" (Matt. 25:34b-36, RSV).

Jesus patiently taught his disciples that his own mission was to serve, not to be served. Even after three years of exposure to his life and fellowship with him, there were those who were still struggling for power and recognition. The mother of James and John asked that her sons be allowed to sit at his side in heaven. The other ten disciples were indignant at this maneuvering for a favor, but they also had missed the thrust of his teaching of the kingdom of God. To all of them he put the point very explicitly: "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:25b-28, RSV).

In the remainder of the New Testament, particularly in the writings of Paul, we find a view of the state which is consistent with the life and teachings of Christ. One of Paul's greatest ideas of Christ's superiority was in Christ's superiority to have control over the powers of this world. We read in Ephesians (1:19-21, NEB): ". . . How vast the resources of his power open to us who trust in him. They are measured by his strength and the might which he exerted in Christ when he raised him from the dead, when he enthroned him at his right hand in the heavenly realms, far above all government and authority, all power and dominion, and any title of sovereignty that can be named not only in this age but in the age to come." By "powers," Paul meant the ideologies, the forces, the structures, the institutions which make up our culture. Paul repeatedly spoke of Christ's deliverance from the bondage of powers, as in Galatians (4:9, RSV): "But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits [world powers], whose slaves you want to be once more?" The powers of established order, of governmental authority, of systematized religious piety had conspired to send Christ to the cross. The resurrection of Christ was a guarantee of his ultimate triumph over all these powers. Meanwhile the sovereign God tolerates and uses them for his purposes.

The state, as one of these powers, is given the limited and provisional but legitimate role of maintaining cohesion and justice in society. Keeping in mind the doctrine of the powers, let us consider the commonly misunderstood passage from Romans. This discourse properly begins with Romans 12:17 and Paul's words about love and justice. The central thought is that the believer must live according to the ethic of sacrificial, unconditional love for others. The Christian's law is not statutory in its character or its nature, and cannot be satisfied except by a love for God and primarily subject to its values and its claims.

With this background, we can then begin reading the very familiar passage: "Every person must submit to the supreme authorities" (Rom. 13:1, NEB). The context tells us that Paul, writing to the Christians in Rome, was asked the question whether their pagan rulers deserved compassion and respect. Paul said yes. The rulers, no matter how evil, are not exempt from our love. These rulers, to the extent they are protecting social justice in the world in which sin still reigns, are carrying out legitimate functions. At this point Paul is speaking of the state at its best, as a servant of God. We must look elsewhere in the Scripture for the teaching of God's judgment on the ungodly state and its rulers. The interpretation of this passage in Romans thirteen is critical to our entire view of the state. Some have thought it to mean that whatever particular system exists is willed in the providence of God. This tends to place the state above God's judgment, which is clearly contrary to Scripture.

The biblical view of the state must always be treated as part of the fallen order, motivated by its pretentions and its striving for power. It is in the final book of the New Testament, Revelation, that we see fully expressed the demonic nature of the state. After a long period of religious toleration, the Roman emperors had turned to persecuting the Christians. Revelation thirteen is an interesting corollary to Romans thirteen; the state at its worst as contrasted with the state at its best. Though we might have difficulty with some of the details of symbolism, we can readily grasp the meaning of the "beast" which was given power to rule, then used the power to subvert justice and to blaspheme God. It attacked God's people and even sought to displace God as an object of worship.

In a related passage in Revelation eighteen, we have the detailed picture of the satanic state, Babylon. The unbridled power, the vainglory, the exploitation, and the rapacious luxury was an apt description of ancient Babylon or the Roman Empire: It even applies to some of our modern states including the United States. The sin of Babylon is latent within any political system and entity; that is, the temptation to substitute the worship of a human system for the worship of God.

What, then, does the Scriptural teaching have to say about our allegiances today, about our witness in society and the political order? Our primary witness and our primary allegiance is to Christ and to his kingdom. This means doing all that he has commanded which will sometimes bring the believer into some conflict with the dominant norms of the society. The life of the Christian is one of social nonconformity in a positive and creative sense. We are free by Christ's power from the bondage to the prevailing values of materialism, nationalism, consumerism, and militarism—just to name a few. Christ's life and his word direct us to a new way of living, a life rooted in love and pointing to a new order.

A major hindrance to allegiance to Christ today is enculturated Christianity, or what we might call civil religion. This is based on inaccurate and unbiblical views of the state as an object of God's favor and the focus of primary loyalty. I am not talking today about the normal loyalties and patriotism we all feel in our hearts, but rather I am speaking of that kind of loyalty that creates idols in our relationship to the state and the nation. The church can only offer hope to mankind if it continues to leave untarnished its vision of a kingdom which transcends and judges the idols of our society. True obedience to Christ leaves no room for

the idolatry expressed in the phrase, "My country right or wrong." As John Quincy Adams said, "I reject that because I am committed to the virtues and the values of eternal justice." These allegiances and loyalties do not, however, provide grounds for withdrawal from political issues and realities.

A key New Testament concept is the "salt and light" dimension to our witness. Paul said we are to live as faultless children of God in a warped and crooked generation in which we shine like stars in a dark world and set forth the word of life. We are to bear witness to our Lord, allowing his words to confront the false gods of our age. We are to give a ray of light to reveal the new order, the kingdom of God, and allow some of its hope to permeate this world. A related biblical figure of speech is that of the yeast in society. A small amount of evil in our society can quickly spread poison and create chaos in this order. Likewise, a small number of obedient Christians at work within their own spheres of life can have great influence. This is where the real change occurs, from communities of people who get beyond the empty rhetoric and sermonizing and live their lives in discipleship. Too often we think that the Christian witness in our society can only come from the top down. We look for indications of the nation's spiritual well-being in the White House, the Congress, or City Hall. We might even try to legislate spirituality if we thought we had the votes.

On the side of the Liberty Bell are inscribed the words: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land." These words, as you know, are taken from Leviticus in a passage that announced to the people of Israel the year of Jubilee. We read from Leviticus (25:10): "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: It shall be a jubilee unto you." The original meaning in the Scriptures of these words is that liberation is proclaimed for the poor and for the oppressed. The jubilee year was an observance which served the plight of the needy, insured just stewardship of wealth and resources, and expressed God's passion for justice. In this Bicentennial year we should turn our attention back again to the biblical meaning of proclaiming liberty as Christian believers gathered here and throughout the world, and particularly our nation. I think that our celebration of the Bicentennial should reach beyond pagentry and rhetoric and should be characterized by concrete acts that flow out of a rededicated commitment to God's justice, to Christ and his kingdom. This is how we can build and nurture our true strength as a people as we evidence our faithfulness to the One who is King of kings and Lord of lords.

CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND POLITICAL DECISIONS

John B. Anderson

When I look over the program that you have for this particular seminar, sponsored by your Christian Life Commission, I cannot help but be impressed with the scope and the breadth and the intensity of this seminar and the efforts that you obviously are making in a very serious way to focus on some of the most important questions facing our nation and our world today.

My topic this morning is "Christian Conscience and Political Decisions." I remember reading an article a few years ago in *Theology Today* which was entitled "Political Theology." The author of the article was a distinguished theologian. He was the theologian Jürgen Moltmann, and in this article he addressed the question of whether or not Christian theology can become a political theology. He points out that if a politician uses his campaign speeches for making biased and high-flown remarks instead of delivering a clear political program to the people, we ought to have an uneasy feeling, just as we sometimes may if we feel that the pulpit is being used for a really political lecture, being used as part of a political forum and discussion rather than one articulating the gospel. He puts it rather succinctly in his piece that politicizing theology and pietizing politicians are neither fish nor fowl.

Well, that is enough I suppose to make even a courageous man shy away from the kind of topic which has been given me this morning of "Christian Conscience and Political Decisions." And I can say by way of digression, and yet I think it is germane to what we are talking about, that you have to be a little bit careful in the House of Representatives when discussing and addressing issues on the floor that you don't make it too patently obvious to your colleagues that you are somehow acting out in a spirit of conscience everything that you do and every decision that you make lest you be labeled somehow somebody who wears his religion on his sleeve and who is seeking to do as Moltmann says, simply acting out the role of a pietizing politician. There are, and perhaps not without justification, some skeptics who can undermine to some extent those who too loudly declaim, in words at least, that they are acting on Christian conscience. On the other hand, the same theologian to whom I referred in this article reminds us that during the Third Reich Dietrich Bonhoffer reminded the church that only those who cry out for the Jews may sing Gregorian chants. In other words, we have no right to speak of God and with God if we do not do it in the midst of the conflicts of our political world.

More than three-quarters of a century ago there was an American politician—and since he is long dead I suppose that we would now refer to him as a statesman—William Jennings Bryan. He delivered a very famous address. As a matter of fact, he gave it worldwide on platforms in more than fifty countries and on more than 3,000 occasions. His address was called "The Prince of Peace." In it he said:

> The platform given to the world by the Prince of Peace is more far-reaching and more comprehensive than any platform ever written by the convention of any party in any country. And when he condensed into one commandment those of the ten which relate to man's duty toward his fellows and enjoined upon us the rule, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," he presented a plan for the solution of all the problems that now vex society, or may hereafter arise. Other remedies may palliate or postpone the day of settlement, but this is all sufficient; and the reconciliation which it effects is a permanent one.

I guess one could almost hope that the man who wrote those words had been more successful in his political career. If my memory serves me correctly, this is the same man who not once or twice but thrice unsuccessfully made a bid for the presidency of the United States. Yet, this morning I think those of us who are believers would certainly subscribe to what he said, that "the platform given to the world by the Prince of Peace" is more fundamentally important and far-reaching than any of the political platforms written by either or any of the political parties over the 200 years of our history. If somehow we could only transmit to others the reconciling force of God's love for us, if we could as Christians really show forth in our lives and in our actions and in our deeds toward others even a small measure of that love that impelled God to send his own Son as our Savior, we would not need a thousand different federal programs to dispense welfare and to try to achieve greater social justice.

I think there are two men, again from the world of theology, clergymen at least, who would agree. I remember back in the era of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, which took place just a decade ago, of reading something by Dr. Robert J. McCracken of the Riverside Church. He was writing of the fact that we were then experimenting in government with the programs of the so-called Great Society. He wrote that the American people had not been stirred to their depths by the challenge to build a Great Society. Why not? Because, he said, our real problem is not technological or economic but moral and spiritual.

The other man to whom I referred was speaking to the problems of 1976, the Reverend Jesse Jackson. I happened to run into him the other day when our paths crossed at that very busy world crossroads, O'Hare Field in Chicago. We were both between flights for a few minutes and stopped to visit. In the course of our conversation I was talking about my concern over some of the problems that confront our nation today that despite our burgeoning deficits, all the money that we were spending and the considerable financial risk that this entailed, we were not really making the kind of advance, the kind of impression on these problems that I would like to see. I was struck when he stopped me by saying that we as a nation and as a people are not as much broke as we are lost—not as much broke as we are lost! Reference was made to a couple of the books that I have written over the years that I have been a member of the Congress. In one of them which I called *Vision and Betrayal in America.* I said that the collapse of American ideals, from which the nation has received its inspiration, and the failure of our institutions to operate effectively and deliberately, the betrayal of individuals who have been assigned positions of leadership in government—all of those things have happened at once. I was referring to what has come to be described with that single word "Watergate." We saw a confluence, as it were, of all of those forces at a single time. That was our unfortunate lot to experience all of these things at the same time. I went on to say that it was my feeling that America needs a vision, a vision which can provide new ideals and moral direction for its people.

It was John Gardner, the head of one of our citizen organizations, who said that it isn't that we need to find new values as a people, as a nation; but we need to be faithful to those that we profess. Someone else, I forget who it was, said much the same thing when he suggested that Christianity has not been tried and found wanting. It is not that Christianity has been tried and that it has failed; it is rather that we who bear the name Christian, who call ourselves Christian, have never really used it, appropriated it, tried it as a solution to the problems that confront us in our nation and in the world.

I spoke just a moment ago of the need as I perceive it for a fresh vision of what our responsibilities as American citizens really are. Those responsibilities are not any more, I need not remind you, confined within national boundaries. Despite Vietnam, despite some of the discouragements that we have suffered and what some people see as diminished American influence in various parts of the world, I think any thinking citizen realizes that the role of America must continue to be global in nature and that our responsibilities as Christian citizens cannot be contained or confined within national borders. What are those responsibilities? How do we define them in the light of Christian conscience? How do we get into the political decision-making process and apply Christian principles to Christian conscience?

I am sure that everyone in this audience remembers the very familiar parable of the Good Samaritan. You remember the fact that it is preceded by an accounting of the fact that a certain lawyer came to Christ and sought to tempt him and asked the question and he responded himself to what was the great commandment. A certain lawyer then asked the question of Christ, "And who is my neighbor?" It occurs to me that this is still the basic question that is on the lips of modern man two thousand years later. Reference was made by Dr. Gaddy in his introduction a moment ago to the fact that in 1968 when the Civil Rights Bill with provisions of law that dealt with open housing that would bar discrimination in the sale and leasing of housing was before the Congress, I was convicted with the idea that my neighbor was the black schoolteacher who had written me out of despair over the fact that although he had been offered a contract to come to my particular community in my hometown and to accept a position, he had fruitlessly searched for decent housing for himself and for his children and family because of the walls of discrimination that existed in that very complacent and comfortable community. As a result he had to turn down an offer in advancement in his profession because he literally was turned away and could not find an adequate place to live. Stories like that convinced me that the words of Scripture that refer to all men as being created of one blood are true. To use the words of the great Norwegian novelist, Sigrid Undset, "minted of the same coin," I was convicted anew by that particular divine precept.

This week on the floor of the House of Representatives, a day or two ago, we had legislation appropriating and authorizing funds for the relief of Guatemalan earthquake victims. We voted $25,000,000, a relatively paltry sum, at least viewed in the total context of our huge national budget. I was reminded, as we debated that question of whether or not we should make some of our resources available to aid the far off victims—some 20,000 dead, hundreds of thousands of others homeless and injured bereft of livelihood, property, and

everything else because of that cataclysmic natural event—of what a great Russian novelist said on one occasion. He said how peculiar it is that in an era of instantaneous communication, in an era when the world is a global village, in a world when through the mystery and marvel of satellite communication you can literally transmit war from the front lines into the living room (and we saw that played out before our very eyes during the Vietnam conflict) and when every other event that takes place anywhere in the world is flashed almost instantly on the screen in front of our eyes, that we still remain as impervious as we do to the great want, the great need, the great suffering experienced by so many of this globe whose population sometime this month will reach that four-billion plateau. We feel more concerned about that person in the next block whom we may know only slightly, who has suffered some relative inconvenience, some injury of a relatively minor sort; we feel more concern about that person than we do about the scores if not hundreds of thousands who may be wiped out in a devastating flood or a typhoon or earthquake and there is a remoteness about all of this as far as our human concerns are involved.

Among the items of legislation that we considered on the floor of the House earlier this week was legislation to continue the state cooperation in the funding of day care centers. There, of course, we were concerned about the working mothers, mothers from poor and disadvantaged and often broken families for whom we were trying to find additional means to continue a program of care for their children.

But, let me at this point, stop just a moment to suggest something that may have been referred to by others who have spoken on some of these topics contained in your program. I think one caveat has to be mentioned, and that is that we have to avoid the pitfalls of subordinating Christian principles to our own narrow, programatic precepts which all to often, because they are human rather than divinely ordained or inspired, limit our ability to see what man's real needs are.

I recall in this context an interview that was published a few years ago with one of the world's greatest statesmen of our time, Dr. Charles Mollech, a former president of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Dr. Mollech was asked the question, "Do you feel, then, that there is too great a tendency for the church to shape and approve particular programs of political and economic action, parties, and platforms while principles are neglected?" And his answer was this:

> This happens at times and is very unfortunate. This does not at all mean that the church does not have something to say about everything. But what it says about any situation should never so tie the gospel down to that situation that the cross and Christ and salvation and hope and faith and love become secondary and dependent upon such programs and pronouncements.

Given the pluralism and the diversity of our society, given the separation of church and state which we hold dear, given that constitutional guarantee under the First Amendment (that clause that says we shall not do those things which would create a state church or a state religion), given all of those things in our history and our tradition and more directly in our constitutional law; I think we have to accept the fact that Christian conscience can and does lead men of faith to take opposing views on such highly emotional issues. For example, there are issues such as amnesty, abortion, the decriminalization of marijuana, the imposition of the death penalty just to enumerate a few in the long list of the more explosive social issues that are normally debated now in political campaigns.

If you turn from that area to issues in the economic field or spectrum of issues, there are such worrisome questions as unemployment, the awful agony of joblessness—that is not too strong a term to use. That problem is not simply an economic problem; it has overpowering, overwhelming social consequences, intense social implications. Should that problem be answered by making the federal government be the employer of last resort, as some suggest? How far should we go in the thrust for a more egalitarian society? I wrote recently that this decade in which we now live—the 1970s—was launched with a great deal of fanfare as being a decade when we were going to concern ourselves as Americans with a quality of life. That was something that was going to be accented in government programs. The emphasis was going to be on the improvement of our physical or our natural environment. Who can quarrel with that as a highly commendable goal? Yet, I also said I believe that an aim of Christian involvement in the political process should be to put the letter "e" in front of that word "quality." That ought to be the emphasis of the church, to make the crooked straight, to let justice mean something in a distributive sense and not just a term that implies retribution. Then, in the words of the prophet Amos, justice would "roll down like a mighty flood," cleansing us from the hypocrisy of a system founded on equality and flourishing amid some of the grossest forms of inequality.

How shall we in a democratic society reform some of the inequities that exist in the political sphere? I have talked about some of the social questions that confront us, some of the economic issues that are of great concern. Let us turn to the political sphere for a moment. It was, as we read in our morning newspaper, a very courageous Baptist minister and a distinguished colleague of mine in the House of Representatives who yesterday led the fight for representation in the District of Columbia. I happen to agree with him. I had to vote as he did on that proposition. Yet, I know that there were some equally good Christians who felt that the unique constitutional and statutory position of the District of Columbia exempted it from the possibility of being accorded the same kind of representation that is given under the Constitution to the fifty states. This is another example, I think, of the diversity of opinion that can exist among Christians on some pretty fundamental political questions.

Look for just a moment at the broader horizon of the world beyond. How does a Christian approach the problem of supporting a sometimes hostile and almost always bitterly divided United Nations? How do we give support to the U.N. decade of development, to the programs that call for appropriations from our treasury, to support the development loan funds administered by that agency? How do we view the prospects of

further accommodations with the Soviet Union? Shall we proceed and take the diplomatic steps that, in the words of a former president, perhaps constitute a risk for peace? We are well accustomed over the course of our history to taking risks in war but, risks for peace, how about that?

Well, at this point in the recitation that I have just given you of the range of problems and potential divisions that confront us as Christians, you must be reminded of that perhaps apocryphal story that is told of Gertrude Stein when she lay dying in a hospital bed. Suddenly she half rose from her hospital bed in a semi-darkened room where she was confined and she cried out in a tremulous voice, "What is the answer? What is the answer?" And when no reply was forthcoming, she half rose again and cried out, "What, then, is the question?" It is far easier for me this morning to suggest what the basic questions are and what some of the potential divisions are than to supply those definitive answers for which we all search.

Let me in the concluding moments suggest some. Over in First Corinthians (13:12) we read those very familiar words: "For now we see through a glass, darkly." How pertinent that seems to be to the confusion that mirrors the image that we have of some of the problems that confront us. The same chapter (13:3) also reminds us: "And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing." There is not a single uncomplicated and distinctively "Christian'" position on all of the difficult economic and political and social issues that I have mentioned, but we are enjoined, are we not, to love one another, to "love thy neighbor as thyself" (Galatians 5:14b, Phillips). It is that great overriding Christian doctrine, not just doctrine but perspective on human affairs, that can guide us in the decision-making process, can motivate us in trying to find the solution to some of these earthly problems. Also, it can help us, it seems to me, to avoid the cynicism of our age, the unawareness, the coldness, the indifferences to human suffering that are so corrosive. It can help us to curb those innately selfish desires that make it so difficult to solve problems because the solutions would involve some sacrifice. It would involve giving up something on our part.

Finally, the uniquely Christian perspective on contemporary problems can teach us that although as Romans (13:1, TLB) reminds us: "There is no government anywhere that God has not placed in power." Well, that doesn't mean that God approves of everything government does. That certainly doesn't mean that he puts his stamp of approval on everything the United States government or the government of any other country undertakes to do. It does not mean that he has surrendered his ultimate sovereignty over the affairs of men.

Incidentally, talking about Romans thirteen and the version I was quoting, I would like to take the opportunity to remind you, since April 15 is drawing near, that if you will read on a little further in that chapter (verse 6), you will also find these words, "Pay your taxes too, for these same two reasons. For government workers need to be paid so that they can keep on doing God's work, serving you."

Well, there is a spiritual void in American life today and I am sure that it is a realization of that fact that has brought this group together in this seminar to study some of the specific issues that are mentioned in your program. I think that if we are going to fill that spiritual void, we have to begin building a spirit of Christian community, of care, concern, of compassion for the needs of a world that is truly lost unless it finds the kind of new life that is talked about in Galatians 2:20. "And the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

Foy Valentine

Standing here on the steps of the Capitol on this historic occasion, we affirm, to begin with, that as Christians we have a God worth serving, a gospel worth proclaiming, a religion worth enjoying, and a church worth sustaining. We are gathered here as Christians.

We are also gathered here as citizens, glad to be celebrating our Country's 200th birthday.

The Bicentennial celebration is a time for focusing on Christian citizenship. It is a time for focusing on justice, the common good, authentic moral values, and reordered priorities—personal, national, and denominational.

This is a time for us to sound the note that will call Christians to repent of our sins of pride, racism, materialism, prejudice, sloth, apathy, and greed. And it is a time for us to submit ourselves anew to God for His great work through us of letting justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

This is a time for celebrating the past, possessing the present, and securing the future.

We Have a Past Worth Celebrating

Responsible involvement in society has been a notable part of our Baptist heritage. All governments derive their just powers, we deeply believe, from the consent of the governed. Voluntarism has always been a central theme of democracy; and voluntarism has been a peculiarly important dimension of the Baptist genius. It is a part of our ongoing task to strengthen the Baptist commitment to voluntary involvement in democracy's ongoing agenda.

Another significant part of our Baptist heritage is our commitment to revolutionary ideas and bold actions. Those ideas and actions have related to the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to the pursuit of happiness, the right to be dealt with by a blindfolded dispenser of justice, and the right to insist that the relationship between any human being and God Almighty is a relationship with which no government or earthly power has any right to interfere.

Our fathers and mothers dreamed the impossible dream.

In a gloriously provincial and little known folk song, my daddy used to sing:

> Come, all you Mississippi girls and listen to my noise.

You'd better not marry those Texas boys.
For if you do, your portion will be
Johnny cake and venison—that's all you'll see;
Johnny cake and venison—that's all you'll see.

It was true. The portion, the lot, of our forebears was johnny cake and venison, poke sallet and cornmeal mush, hoecake and sorghum molasses.

But the portion of our Baptist forebears, partly given by God and partly claimed like Jacob wrestling with the angel of the Lord at Jabbok's ford, was something else, too. It was courage; it was fortitude, risk, nerve, vigor, work, blood, sweat, and tears in pursuit of great ideas, noble aspirations, enduring visions.

"Poor folks have poor ways," they said as they pushed back the wilderness and broke new ground, as they built little cabins in the clearings and little one-room meeting houses for their churches, as they settled down and read their Bibles and carefully cultivated the character without which no nation or denomination can long endure. Today we affirm that great heritage and seek to cherish and cultivate its values. This is a facet of our corporate personality that we must keep brightly polished if we are to be true to God who sustains us and our Baptist forebears who parented us.

Religious liberty and separation of church and state constitute for Americans in general and for Baptists in particular a kind of cornerstone for the house of our heritage. Baptists stand uncompromisingly and on principle with all those who seek to maintain religious liberty and its magnificent corollary, separation of church and state.

The principle of church-state separation espoused by the Baptists and other radical sects found acceptance in this country among the early intelligentsia and political leaders as well as with some other religious bodies.

The importance of this principle was so generally accepted that its statement in clear and unmistakable terms became the First Amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

We have a past worth celebrating; but there is more.

We Have a Present Worth Possessing

Our duty now is the duty of redeeming the time, of possessing the land, of claiming dominion over what God means for us to be stewards of.

There are perils which this nation must avoid; and Baptists must be active in the effort to steer both the churches and the ship of state away from these shoals. We must avoid "Christian" political parties. We must avoid union of church and state. We must avoid a rampant and vigorously aggressive secularism. And particularly at this point in our history, we must avoid civil religion.

Then there are challenges which we must meet.

First, the recovery of family life must be effected.

Second, a new commitment to integrity must be fostered. "Rome perished," said Saint Augustine, "for want of order in the soul." The modern world wants to play tennis with the net down. It thinks that in order to breathe, you have to break out all the windows. Christians, however, accept the importance of discipline and cross bearing as the badges of integrity.

Third, a citizenship worthy of the gospel must be cultivated. In Philippians 1 (v. 27a, RSV), Paul says, "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel. . . ." The word translated as "manner of life," *politeuo*, from which we get our word, politics, is the nearest word to citizenship in the New Testament. Paul is saying, "Let your citizenship be worthy of the gospel!" And this is what Baptists should be saying as vigorously and forcefully as we can during this Bicentennial celebration.

We have a past worth celebrating; we have a present worth possessing; and

We Have a Future Worth Securing

It is true that our spirit is wounded. Watergate, the Vietnam War, the economic crisis, the cynical assault on the Constitution's Bill of Rights, crime in the streets and crime in the suites, lawlessness and disorder unchecked by the powers that be, and a hundred other compromises have wounded our spirit in the political realm.

Our spirit is also wounded in the realm of religion.

We have sown the wind. There can be no real surprise that we are reaping the whirlwind.

To the extent that we have been indifferent to our past and ignorant of our heritage, we have experienced an ominous loss of faith for the present and hope for the future.

Still, God has something far better for us. It is something better than anything we have dared to hope or think.

Now in obedience to God's high calling in Christ Jesus, let us realize we have a place to fill, a dream to follow, a calling to obey. May God help us now to go forward and possess the land.

COVENANT OF COMMITMENT TO CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

C. Welton Gaddy

Bearing witness to the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the primacy of our citizenship in the Kingdom of God while recognizing the authority of the State and the importance of our responsibilities as citizens of earthly governments, let us join together in a covenant of commitment to Christian citizenship.

For the high calling of God in Christ wherein we experience redemption and the sure promise of God's abiding presence whereby we have hope,

WE EXPRESS PRAISE.

For a nation founded on the moral principles of freedom and justice and a system of government structured for the involvement of the citizenry,

WE GIVE THANKS.

To a study of biblical teachings on the nature of government and the role of God's people in it as well as an awareness of the characteristics of contemporary governments and the needs for God's people within them,

To reflection upon this nation's past for the purpose of preparation for this nation's future,

To analysis of the meaning of freedom so as to de-

fine the proper conditions for national security, personal rights, and the public good,
To an examination of governmental priorities, legislative proposals, political platforms, and campaigning candidates from the perspective of Christian morality,

WE COMMIT OUR MINDS.

To a certain proclamation of the Word of God in interaction with and in judgment upon the words of people,
To pastoral prayers on behalf of government structures, political leaders, social problems, and citizen action,
To prophetic pronouncements correcting the denigration of politics and affirming government as a realm of Christian ministry,
To enthusiastic expressions of praise for that which is good in the American experience and bold protests of that which is bad,

WE GIVE OUR VOICES.

To the selection of qualified candidates for public office, the formation of party platforms reflective of justice, and the registration of intelligent votes,
To efforts aimed at shaping public opinion and molding political sentiment supportive of morally responsible governmental policies,
To that work of liberation which sets all people free and seeks to maintain the freedom,
To participation in political processes within local precincts and the larger community,

WE DIRECT OUR ACTIONS.

To enhance public respect for public servants through encouraging a preoccupation with integrity,
To help avoid the dangers of a corporate naivete which seeks simplistic solutions for complex problems,
To assist in the development of a consciousness of interdependence and a willingness to pledge allegiance to citizenship in the world,
To strengthen the democratic process and the role of morality in it,

WE EXERCISE OUR INFLUENCE.

WE COVENANT TOGETHER TO THINK, SPEAK, AND ACT AS CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD MAKING A DIFFERENCE FOR GOOD IN THE KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD THROUGH A CITIZENSHIP "WORTHY OF THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST."

PRAYER FOR THE NATION

C. Welton Gaddy

Our Father,

We join this prayer with all intercessions of the past which have been addressed to you on behalf of this nation and we offer it in the name of our Lord.

Even as the bold voyagers who first came to this land praised you for opportunities of life in a new world, we praise you for your compassionate interest in the government of this world.

Even as those battered revolutionaries of the eighteenth century prayed for strength to win a seemingly hopeless military victory so as to establish a nation, we pray for strength to continue building within that nation a viable structure of government.

Even as the heavily burdened leaders of Civil War America prayed for reconciliation within the republic, we pray for a national unity which affirms diversity but abhors divisiveness.

Even as the multitudes have sought your help in the various crises of the American experience, we seek your help during every hour of our citizenship:

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land," you have taught us.

Thus, we confess our sins. Dear God, forgive us:

- for permitting, as a citizenry, public symbols of faith to replace the kind of personal faith without which the symbols are meaningless.
- for occasionally allowing patriotic pride to deteriorate into a national arrogance hardly distinguishable from religious idolatry.
- for filling our speeches with the rhetoric of "liberty and justice for all" but for failing to assure throughout the land the realization of "liberty and justice for all."
- for stark apathy regarding political institutions, timid aversions to political power, and inept action in political processes.

Forgive us, O Lord.

"I exhort therefore that . . . supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made . . . for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," you have taught us.

Thus, we pray for the leaders of this nation:

- instill within them integrity that they may respond to their constituencies openly and to public needs responsibly,
- motivate them to view their roles as that of public servants, not imperial sovereigns,
- keep ever before them the importance of our interdependence within the world as well as our independence at home.

"Righteousness exalts a nation but sin is a reproach to any people," you have taught us.

Thus, we pray for all of our citizenry:

- strengthen us in our support of those who speak and act on behalf of issues which are right,
- let justice roll down in our courts, schools, health care institutions, businesses, and government agencies,
- teach us to measure success in terms of quality of life rather than a quantity of goods,
- instill within us a conscience which will continue to prick at our moral nerve until we begin changing our life-styles so as to feed the hungry, care for prisoners, and be of help to all of those who are in need,
- help us learn the things that make for peace.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, and reveal to us the means by which we may be ministers of your answer.

For the good of this nation we praise you, confess to you, and call upon you for help in the name of Jesus Christ in relationship to whom we have come to know "the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever."

Amen.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE COMMISSION
of the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

2500/6/76