

REPORT from the CAPITAL



JOHN W. BAKER

John Baker was determined to defend the First Amendment, its provision for the free exercise of religion and the separation of Church and state. In this cause he would work long hours, walking the halls of Congress, pleading persuasively, and painstakingly bringing together individuals and organizations who would not normally be in the same room. Bridge builder, realist, believer, he followed the incarnational model of the New Testament to flesh out his faith.

**SOUTHERN BAPTIST HISTORICAL
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES**
Historical Commission, SBC
Nashville, Tennessee

REPORT from the CAPITAL

"... a civil state 'with full liberty in religious concerns'".

Vol. 40, No. 2

February, 1985

Articles:

Nay 4
By Larry L. Greenfield

A Conversation with Donald Shriver 7
By Bill McKenzie

Review Essay: The Great Evangelical Disaster 10
By Mark Caldwell

Comment 11

Features

Washington Observations 3
By Stan Hasteley and Larry G. Chesser

Views of the Wall 6
By Stan Hasteley

News in Brief 7
By Larry G. Chesser

International Dateline 12
By Victor Tupitza

Correspondence 14

Reflections 15
By James M. Dunn

Reviews 16

Cover: John W. Baker, general counsel and for 15 years director of research services for the Baptist Joint Committee, one of the nation's foremost specialists in church-state law, died on January 12, 1985. The May issue of REPORT will honor his work. Friends of Dr. Baker are invited to submit tributes for publication in that issue.

Executive Director: James M. Dunn
Editor: Victor Tupitza

Contributing Editors: John W. Baker, Stan L. Hasteley, Larry G. Chesser, Glenn Saul, Kenneth L. Smith, Gary McNeil, Jeanette Holt, Marc Mullinax

REPORT from the CAPITAL is published 10 times each year by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, a denominational agency maintained in the Nation's capital by its nine member bodies: The American Baptist Churches in the USA, Baptist Federation of Canada, Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention of America, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., North American Baptist Conference, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc., Seventh Day Baptist General Conference and Southern Baptist Convention.

Subscriptions: Single, \$6.00 one year, \$11.00 two years; Club Rate (10 or more) \$5.00 per each year; Student Rate \$2.50 single year. Foreign, please add \$2.00 postage.

BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS
200 Maryland Avenue, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

Witness to that Light

(From a memorial service for John W. Baker)

There was a man sent from God, whose name was John—not the remote biblical figure far removed from us, but a man—a big man—whom we have known and loved up close. We don't need to make him bigger now than in life—though that would not be easy to do. But we would betray the John we have known if we did not allow this hour to be a witness to the Light who came into our world in Jesus. And when this hour is over, we will know that the man sent from God whose name was John has once again borne witness to the Light—as he did so unforgettably during his time with us.

Listen to the powerful witness of his life—listen to the times you shared with him, and to what you saw in him. One thing I know, John wants the darkness to be dispelled for all of us. He wants us to be delivered from despair, and to see the Light in the face of the Christ who is our Friend, too.

(Rev.) Steve Hyde

First Baptist Church, Silver Spring, MD

A common concern for religious liberty and for matters of church and state gave me repeated opportunities to work with John. He was a man who combined an advocate's skill with a scholar's appetite to produce balanced, reliable judgments about issues of religion, government and politics. No ordinary lawyer, John was at home with the wisdom of Sir Edward Coke—an English jurist whom he much admired—as with the opinions of the United States Supreme Court.

I found in John Baker the qualities of unimpeachable integrity, personal compassion, sensitivity, generosity, openness of mind, common sense and just plain fun.

John devoted his lifetime to helping keep alive the values which lie at the base of American freedoms. He leaves his mark on the course of public events. Equally, he leaves an indelible impression on the hearts and minds of those who were privileged to know him.

A. E. Dick Howard

University of Virginia, School of Law

Despite the shock, grief, anger and questions of the last few days, my major emotion is "Thank you, God, for John Baker." He was my boss for 15 years—and how proud I have always been to call him that! His large body housed an equally big mind, giant integrity, and an enormously loving heart.

He loved God and God's Church. He held strong convictions, sharing mostly by living his beliefs. His understanding of God and the Bible convinced him that religious liberty is for everyone and is best protected by separating Church and state. He worked with many people of varying persuasions to protect the rights of everyone.

He loved to learn—study and research were his favorite things. The awesome thing was that even though he constantly pumped new information into his brain, he never forgot anything—from every Burma Shave sign that graced the highways to the most complicated interrelationship of legislation with judicial decisions. I will miss him, his idiosyncracies, his inversion of numbers, his voice calling from down the hall.

Rosemary Brevard
Research Assistant

Despite 50 newcomers to its ranks and some significant leadership changes, the 99th Congress looked remarkably similar to its predecessor in the range of bills introduced during its opening days. Among early proposals were the familiar but controversial measures designed to reverse public policy on school prayer and abortion—sponsored primarily by the same lawmakers who pushed them in the 98th Congress.

What may prove different in the new Congress is how much center stage time is given these proposals and other long-term items on the New Right's wish list, which includes tuition tax credits and anti-busing measures. During the last Congress, then-Senate majority leader Howard H. Baker, Jr., accommodated weeks of floor time for battle over these issues, none of which came close to passage.

Early signals from new Senate majority leader Robert J. Dole, R-Kan., indicate he may stick with other priorities, at least until Congress finds some solution to the staggering federal budget deficits. Although Dole voted with Senate backers of school prayer and abortion legislation during the last Congress, and led unsuccessful efforts to gain Senate passage of President Reagan's tuition tax credit proposal, he has repeatedly underscored his intention to tackle the federal deficits early this year.

"Definitely at this point, the budget deficit is his number one priority," a Dole aide said but emphasized that did not rule out issues such as abortion and school prayer becoming priorities later. "In terms of what is going to happen on the floor, no decisions have been made," the aide said. ●

On the other side of Capitol Hill, the 1984 elections are expected to have little change on the cool treatment proposals on abortion and school prayer regularly receive from the Judiciary Committee. House members, too, are concerned over the budget deficits. In both houses, 15 constitutional amendments on the budget process and/or budget deficits were proposed on the first day of the new Congress. In addition, five proposals to give presidents line-item veto authority were offered.

Although congressional and White House focus on budget deficits and tax reform packages does not preclude action on issues such as school prayer and abortion, it means they will occupy back-burner status for the first part of the 99th Congress. In addition, the new makeup of the House and Senate offers no realistic hope that these issues will fare any better in the next two years than they did during the past four.

These long odds failed to deter long-time advocates of school prayer and anti-abortion measures from reintroducing their now-familiar proposals. Among the most prominent early proposals were those sponsored by Republican Senators Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Jesse Helms of North Carolina. As in the past, Hatch and Thurmond have proposed constitutional amendments requiring two-thirds votes in both houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures to reverse national public policy on school prayer and abortion while Helms has submitted bills which require passage by a simple majority. ●



"nay" One dissenting Baptist vote on "Equal Access"

It came, at first, as a pleasant surprise to see that Baptists could find widespread agreement to support federal legislation that encouraged the practice of religion in public schools. The Equal Access Act provided a way for Baptists to be uniformly pro-religious!

Even the bulldog protector of religious freedom, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, failed to come up with a warning growl. In fact, it did more than remain growl-less or bark-less; the watchdog turned guide dog and actually led the legislation into the halls of Congress. A pleased master (the Executive Committee of the BJC) "commended their Washington staff for its role in the passage of the Equal Access Act and for helping write guidelines for its implementation." (See "Washington Observations," in *Report from the Capital*, November-December, 1984, p.3.)

Perhaps it comes from being a Baptist too long—being conditioned to believe that, in temporal existence, it is impossible in principle for Baptists to be so thoroughly in agreement—that later led me to be suspicious. Or maybe it was from reading excessive amounts of Baptist thought, including *Report from the Capital*, that had programmed me to want to spoil anything giving the appearance of Baptist uniformity. Whatever the cause (I will even entertain the possibility that it has something to do with an unresolved conflict in my early human development) I want to cast at least one dissenting Baptist vote on "equal access."

Clearly, with so much consensus among my Baptist brothers and sisters, my "nay" on the question must be defended. I think there are reasons to object, but these might well be just rationalizations. Only one of those rationalizations, however, relates to being a spoiler.

I grant that the legislation seems to make good sense on Baptist principles. Words like "equal" and "access" ring the right Baptist bells. Provisions for protecting the "voluntary" character of associations of students seem to harmonize with Baptist ecclesiology, just as the guidelines that limit the influence of a person in authority (e.g., teachers, administrators, etc.) in those groups are in rhythm with a Baptist principle of "soul liberty."

The legislation seems to be authentically American too, for many of the same reasons that it looks acceptable Baptistly. Within the walls of a school, the "wall of separation" appears to be firmly in place.

Still, I vote "nay." Why? What are my negative reasons or rationalizations?

First, "equality" here turns out to be something quite different than what I want to affirm as a Baptist Christian. What is made equal in the legislation? What does equality mean in the Equal Access Act? Not equality before God. Not equality in being under God's judgment and the recipient of God's grace. Not equality within the Body of Christ. It is, rather, equality of religious associations with other noncurriculum-related, student-initiated groups. It is to treat religious associations the same as any other human association.

The implications of this meaning of equality are various—and variously important. I personally bristle at the

notion that religious associations are equivalent to political associations (Young Democrats, Young Republicans, Young Socialists, whatever) or social associations (Photography Club, Latin Club, United Nations Club, etc.) whatever the personal and public merits those associations nurture. But realize that I have no right to force on others my own views about the importance and centrality of faith and religious associations.

The matter moves beyond my personal understandings, however, when equality of associations could mean that the rules of a school for all associations—by virtue of a meeting taking place in a public facility or a public facility of a certain kind—could restrict freedom of religion. Public officials (e.g., school administrators or boards of education), as I understand it, have the right and responsibility to establish guidelines for behavior that will occur by groups meeting in public facilities, and to enforce those guidelines uniformly. What happens, however, when in the free and faithful exercise of a religion, a group violates those guidelines? By allowing religious associations to be treated as equal to other human associations, aren't we inviting the State to regulate religion? What then has happened to freedom of religion?

Furthermore, by treating equality as applicable to all associations, including religious associations, we now seem to have given the State license to monitor religious groups and persons within them. And it is a small step from enforcing guidelines to finding the means to know whether guidelines are being followed, and in so doing learning more about the beliefs and practices of those who make up a group—irrespective of whether such information relates to the guidelines. An unspoken yet real invitation for the possible use of illicit devices for social control is extended in the Equal Access Act, and the justification comes from a faulty understanding of equality regarding the nature of religion in our nation.

Similarly, "access" turns out to be something quite different than what I want to affirm as a Baptist Christian.

Dr. Greenfield, an American Baptist, USA clergyman, is president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School/Bexley Hall/Crozer Theological Seminary in Rochester, New York.

Again, the implications are various—and variously important.

The Act provides for access to facilities. Are we Christians short of facilities? Are our children being denied the freedom of religion and religious association because there is no place to meet outside the public schools? Must we ask the State to provide us access to facilities since we do not have or cannot afford our own? Or is it a matter of most of us being taxpayers and, therefore, claiming some ownership of and access to our public facilities? But do we really want to tie the exercise of our ownership and rights of access as citizens to our self-interest as Christians?

If it is not because of a facilities shortage or of "getting our due," what are our motivations for wanting access to public facilities—and how appropriate are those motivations? Should our motives be Christian nurture and education, we might want to examine whether these objectives can best take place within the context and limitations (restrictions) of public facilities. Should, on the other hand, our motives be evangelism, we might want to consider similar questions—and logical implications that flow from such a motive.

With any form of Christian witness having access to public facilities, aren't we granting a similar right to any other expression of religion, whether it be an established religion or a new sect? Even if Christian groups were not to engage in evangelism, what would prohibit other religious groups from doing so—be it overtly, subtly, through peer pressure, reaction to authority, etc., and however strongly this is encouraged, tolerated, or restricted by school officials? These are questions we may want to ask ourselves again, keeping in mind that we have not been granted a special privilege (which I hope we would not want to accept anyway), but a right that is open now to any religious group, and recognizing that our children will be subjected to the appeals of other religious groups in our public schools.

Our answer to these questions, of course, can be formulated in a strictly self-interested way—e.g., what will be the effect of this on my children, what will be the consequence of this on our church, or our neighborhood and city? I might argue, in the end, that my child's faith will be stronger by being exposed to a wide range of religious associations in her public school and thus applaud "equal access;" but I am still acting in self-interest thereby, just as someone else might oppose the legislation because they don't want their

child to be exposed to a variety of religious options in the setting of the public schools.

The *non-self-interested issue*, however, has to do with *principle*: whether, in a nation that holds to the doctrines that the Congress "must not interfere with freedom of religion ... and shall make no law respecting an establish-

ment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ...," the provision to allow religious associations "equal access" to public facilities will permit the doctrines to be practiced.

... as in the various prayer amendments, the provision to respect an established religion has the effect, if only through subtle and implicit means, to infringe on the freedom of an individual student by sanctioning certain religious associations through their official use of public facilities.

ment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ...," the provision to allow religious associations "equal access" to public facilities will permit the doctrines to be practiced.

Since I have already commented above on the possibility of restrictions being applied to religious groups as part of the responsibility of public officials to enforce guidelines for the use of public facilities, I need not repeat here the challenge to freedom of religion the legislation presents, except to emphasize that the challenge, in my judgment, is genuine.

The "establishment clause" is still another matter. It also is challenged by the Equal Access Act because, in effect, the Congress has enacted legislation that respects establishments of religion by permitting public facilities to be the arenas in which established religions can be practiced.

Granted, it is one thing for students to be taught *about* religion and religions in the public schools; it is quite another for students to be taught to *practice* religion in the public schools. So far so good, concerning the "equal access" legislation: the provisions relate to non-curricular activities and groups. But by allowing for the practice of religion in public facilities—the same facilities where religion can only be taught about in the curriculum—the State can make judgments about what is and is not an established religion and thereby would be respecting and giving support to the *practice* of any religions that are deemed established.

At one broad and practical level, the issue comes down to whether public facilities—the public schools—should be the arena in which the religious life of the country should be played out. Even if not a part of the curriculum, should the public schools serve also as the location of "church" for the nation's children, the place for their religious nurture and education, the setting for their evangelization? If the

Constitution and our own common sense tell us no, then we need to re-examine the "equal access" legislation. But, you ask, what of that added phrase of the "establishment clause" concerning the congressional restraint on the "free exercise" of religion? Here, it would seem, is the justifica-

tion for the "equal access" legislation. Maybe so. A question, however, would need to be addressed on the matter of how we resolve the conflicts that emerge anytime a contradiction appears by affirming all parts of the First Amendment concerning religion—such as in the various prayer amendments. My argument would be, as in the prayer amendments, that nothing prior to the enactment of the Equal Access Act prohibited a student from being religiously free individually or to form and participate in a religious association. But, as in the various prayer amendments, the provision to respect an established religion has the effect, if only through subtle and implicit means, to infringe on the freedom of an individual student by sanctioning certain religious associations through their official use of public facilities. At least when religious associations meet in places other than public facilities the individual can exercise the maximum amount of freedom regarding the voluntary choice to participate or not participate among all the finite religious alternatives available. In their absence, the individual is less free. In their limited presence, freedom is also restricted.

That, finally, gets us back to the heart of the Baptist matter—about the voluntary character of the church, about the nature of religious authority, about "soul liberty." Will these be advanced by allowing religious groups "equal access" to public school facilities, however carefully the guidelines for implementation have been developed by Congress, with the help of the Baptist Joint Committee? Or, despite the right ringing bells and the right sounding rhythm, is this another case in which there will be erosion of principles of "... a civil state 'with full liberty in religious concerns'" (the banner of *Report from the Capital*)?

may continued on page 14

The First Amendment built "a wall of separation between Church and State."—Thomas Jefferson

VIEWS OF THE WALL

Stan Hasteley



The recent hospitalization of Supreme Court Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr. raises anew the questions of how long the present high court can remain intact and of how many new justices Ronald Reagan will be able to nominate in a second term. Powell's illness—he underwent surgery for the removal of his cancerous prostate gland—is a poignant reminder that the average age of the justices is 70, and others of the present justices may face any number of health problems in the near future.

Five of the nine are 76 or older, while three others are above 60. Sandra Day O'Connor, at 54 the newest justice, is easily the youngest. At 60, O'Connor's Stanford Law colleague, William H. Rehnquist, is the second youngest, with John Paul Stevens at 64 and Byron R. White at 67 the only others under age 76.

The five septuagenarians are headed by Justice William J. Brennan Jr. (78), followed closely by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger (77), and Justices Powell (77), Thurgood Marshall (76) and Harry A. Blackmun (76).

Although Powell is expected back on the bench in February after the Mayo Clinic surgical procedure, observers of the court are anticipating the possibility of several resignations over the next year or two. Most of these observers believe that any appointments President Reagan makes in his new term must come during the first two years of his new term. They point to the likelihood of a Democratic takeover of the U.S. Senate in the 1986 off-year elections in which the Republicans will have 22 members facing reelection, the Democrats only 12.

A reinvigorated Democratic Senate might well be able to stall on appointments Reagan would make during the latter half of his term in hopes of the subsequent 1988 election of a Democrat as president.

For now, of course, all this is speculative. Despite all the campaign talk in the recent elections about the high court's future, it is conceivable that O'Connor will turn out to be Reagan's only appointment. Supreme Court justices—and all federal judges, for that matter—are appointed for life and may stay on the bench as long as they choose to do so. A look at the court's history provides ample proof that nu-

merous justices have stayed well into their 80s.

Yet many question whether the so-called "liberal" justices, Brennan and Marshall, can make it through a second Reagan term. Brennan may be the more likely to do so, appearing fit and vigorous. But Marshall is known to suffer from emphysema and perhaps other illnesses as well.

Blackmun—along with Burger, Powell and Rehnquist the four appointees of Richard Nixon—has been the one member of that quartet to join the "liberal" wing of the court on occasion. On that wing, only Stevens, increasingly allied with Brennan and Marshall, is a "young" justice.

Despite such an appraisal of the current ideological breakdown of the high court, a disclaimer must quickly be entered. Labels of "liberal" and "conservative" are perhaps worst when applied to judges of all public servants. On the Supreme Court, for example, a justice may be perceived as liberal in one area of constitutional law, conservative in another.

And unfortunately, journalists are continuously guilty of misapplying those labels, as is well illustrated in the area of church-state law. A strong argument can be made that those justices who contend for a strict interpretation of the religion clauses of the First Amendment are indeed the conservatives in that area. No recent justice, then, was more conservative in his church-state views than was the late William O. Douglas, who liked to say that "the First Amendment says what it means and means what it says." That amounts not only to strict constructionism but to judicial literalism, and nothing could be more conservative.

Who, then, are the true church-state conservatives on this high court? A few of the headline cases of the last couple of terms provide clues.

In *Mueller v. Allen*, 103 S.Ct. 3062 (1983), decided in June, 1983, the court split 5-4 in upholding a Minnesota statute providing tuition tax deductions to parents who send their children to church-related and other private schools. The four dissenters: Marshall, Brennan, Blackmun and Stevens.

The following month the court ruled 6-3 that the state of Nebraska may con-

tinue its practice of employing over a long-term period a chaplain from one denomination to provide public prayers and other ministries to the unicameral state legislature. Brennan, Marshall and Stevens dissented [*Marsh v. Chambers*, 103 S.Ct. 3330 (1983)].

Last March, in *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 104S.Ct.1355 (1984), the court held 5-4 that the city of Pawtucket, R.I. may continue its practice of displaying a publicly-owned nativity scene in a private park. The dissenters: Brennan, Marshall, Blackmun and Stevens.

(In each of these cases, O'Connor has been a prime target of attorneys arguing the side of church-state separation. Yet they have failed in every major church-state case to sway her. O'Connor's performance in the church-state area has been in fact a profound disappointment to advocates of strict separation.)

Of the four roughly pro-separationist justices, three are in the 76-and-older group, giving advocates of strict separation a good case of the judicial jitters. What will Reagan do if one or more of these four leave?

Although the recent presidential campaign focused more than usual on the future of the Supreme Court, it never became one of the dominant issues.

In spite of Walter Mondale's occasional efforts to boost the question (in a speech at George Washington University he exclaimed that the campaign was about "Jerry Falwell picking justices for the Supreme Court"), Reagan easily deflected Mondale's challenge by pointing to O'Connor as an ideal appointment that broke the two-century precedent against women on the high court.

Beyond that achievement, Reagan was able to paint O'Connor as a tough justice on criminal issues, the area of law that most interests the average citizen. When that average citizen thought about the possibility of Reagan's making another four or five appointments to the court, he more than likely approved the idea that the president would appoint more tough justices.

Such an assessment is probably correct. Ronald Reagan is himself more interested in criminal law than he is in

Continued on page 14.

A Conversation with Donald Shriver

Ripon Forum: Ernesto Cardenal, the Nicaraguan priest who also serves as minister of the interior in the Sandinista government, wrote in his treatise on liberation theology, "For me, the four Gospels are all equally Communist. I'm a Marxist who believes in God, follows Christ, and is a revolutionary for the sake of his kingdom." What is your reaction to his statement, which reflects the thinking among some church people today in Central America?

Shriver: As it stands, I have some problems with it. I believe political philosophies are less enduring than the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I have no objection to people trying to correlate their political philosophies with the Bible or ancient Christian traditions. I expect those philosophies to be plural and diverse. But, at the same time, I fear the identification of Gospel truth with political truth of any kind.

While you cannot avoid the political implications of Christian faith and ethics, the Christian must have some distance between the formulation of his or her faith and the formulation of his or her politics. Unless there is some distance, and some dialogue, there can never be any critical resource in the Gospel for changing that ideology, nudged by experience and reflection on that Gospel.

I know some other liberation theologians who have that distance because they think Marxism, as a tool of social analysis, is in a different category than the eschatological vision of the New Testament. For them, Marxism is more a method of understanding post-industrial society; it is a rather recent

analytical system that permits one to see things in this society one otherwise would not. But, as for the definition of social justice, not to speak of love and community, these theologians would reserve something original and more "revolutionary" in the Christian sources that is not comprehended in Marxism."

Ripon Forum: Much was written during the 1984 presidential campaign about the church's role in political life. What sort of imagination should the church give to American politics?

Shriver: Let me give an illustration. A young woman who recently graduated from this school took a pastorate in the Midwest. She decided to pray each week during the worship service for the people of a different country. After two or three months, she received a protest from some people in the church who did not want to be so regularly worried about people in other parts of the world. I believe that if there is somebody you refuse to pray about, then that says something about your religious imagination.

In addition to prayer, the church can furnish its own images of the world through international human contacts and the appropriate use of media communication. Missionaries, at their best, have been able to return to their home countries and make the humanity of those foreign nations real.

We must also move beyond abstract religious categories—such as "love God and thy neighbor"—to give them concrete locality. That's moving against the natural egotism of the human being and cultures. We need to know there are fathers and mothers and children ("Look, this warfare is about human beings as alive as you and me") in the Soviet Union whom our missiles are aimed towards, and they need to know the same about us. Neither side is innocent of villifying and denigrating the humanity of the

The nuclear weapon is the first weapon ever capable of killing a nation.

other. If we don't realize that, and don't exercise our imagination, then we literally don't know what we do.

Ripon Forum: Pope John Paul II argues that religion must transcend politics, and that, in Christianity, the primacy of the spiritual can be surrendered by no faith worthy its name. At what point does religion transcend politics?

Shriver: There are times historically when politics transcends religion. Religion has its share of crimes in the world, and they are being committed daily. One can think of the problems in India, Iran, and Ireland, where religion is used as an excuse to murder your neighbor...

Therefore, let me reformulate the pope's statement: *God transcends our politics, our religion, and our spirituality.* For me, this is a very important theological point. Otherwise, we end up taking our religious feelings, institutions, and principles as the ultimate measure of everything. Anybody who really believes in God knows that God is the judge of all those things. How can we ever develop a spirituality of the "humble and contrite heart" if we're not on occasion ready to say, "Lord, that version of humility and contrition I had last year was not enough." Paul Tillich would call this the "Protestant Principle"—the perpetual revisibility of all things human under the judgment and grace of God. To wrap anything dear to human beings in the mantle of religion is to court idolatry. □

Dr. Donald Shriver is president of Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY. The full text of this conversation appeared in the *Ripon Forum*, magazine of the Ripon Society, Washington, DC. The conversation was carried on with editor Bill McKenzie.

News in Brief

BJCPA's John W. Baker succumbs to heart failure

WASHINGTON
John W. Baker, general counsel and director of research services for the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, and one of the nation's foremost specialists in church-state law, died Jan. 12 at his home in Bethesda, Md. He was 64.

Baker, who had been ill since suffering a heart attack on Christmas Day, died of congestive heart failure.

Baker was born in Austin, Texas, Aug. 6, 1920, was graduated from the University of Texas (B.A.), the University of California, Berkeley (Ph.D.) and The American University, Washington (J.D.), and was a college political science professor for 22 years. His teaching posts included Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas; University of California, Berkeley; University of Florida; Harvard University; Humboldt State College of California; and The College of Wooster, Ohio. At Wooster, he was chairman of the political science department.

During 1967-68, when he was a visiting scholar at The Brookings Institution here, he was asked by the late C. Emanuel Carlson to join the staff of the Washington-based Baptist Joint Committee, a post he assumed in 1969. He earned his law degree at American University's Washington College of Law in 1977.

During his 15 years with the Baptist Joint Committee, Baker wrote or filed 21 friend-of-the-court briefs at the U.S. Supreme Court and other federal panels, the latest on Jan. 7 in a challenge to the Reagan administration's decision last year to establish full diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

A member of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court and of numerous professional societies, Baker was known for his ability to bring together attorneys representing churches and other interested parties in causes ranging from opposition to state-sponsored religious exercises in public schools to support for equal access legislation.

An active lay church leader, Baker belonged to First Baptist Church, Silver Spring, Md., and served in various capacities for the District of Columbia Baptist Convention.

He acted on several occasions as an unofficial consultant to the resolutions

committee at the annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, and at the time of his death was serving as a trustee of Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, Calif.

He is survived by his wife, Mary E. Posey Baker of Bethesda, Md.; sons Robert S. Baker of Beckley, W. Va.; Frederick D. Baker of San Francisco; Brian Lee Baker of Washington; and John P. Baker of Washington; and six grandchildren. □

Baptist Joint Committee joins Vatican challenge

WASHINGTON
Insisting that President Reagan is bound by the First Amendment's ban on an establishment of religion, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs has asked a federal district court to strike down as unconstitutional Reagan's appointment last year of an ambassador to the Vatican.

The Washington-based agency, representing the church-state interests of eight U.S. Baptist bodies submitted its views Jan. 7 in a case brought by Americans United for Separation of Church and State, more than 15 religious bodies and numerous individual taxpayers challenging the new diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Holy See.

Last year, President Reagan appointed William A. Wilson as the first U.S. ambassador to the Holy See in more than a century after Congress lifted a statutory ban on diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Vatican.

Baptist Joint Committee general counsel John W. Baker, in a friend-of-the-court brief to the U.S. District Court for Eastern Pennsylvania, declared that "the President's power to appoint ambassadors is limited by the establishment clause."

Baker cited the 1947 Supreme Court decision in *Everson v. Board of Education*, a ruling that held the establishment clause "means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can ... pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions or prefer one religion over another ... No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they



Rep. William H. Gray III, a Baptist minister from Philadelphia, has been elected the new chairman of the Budget Committee by House Democratic colleagues. Gray, who has been a member of Congress since 1978, is pastor of Philadelphia's Bright Hope Baptist Church, affiliated with the Progressive National Baptist Convention and the American Baptist Churches, USA.

may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

By reestablishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican, Baker continued, Reagan violated all three parts of another high court test—first enunciated in 1971—that governmental actions must reflect a secular purpose, must have the primary effect of neither advancing nor inhibiting religion, and must not excessively entangle government with religion.

On the last point—excessive entanglement—Baker argued further that the decision to establish formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See already has resulted in "divisiveness along sectarian lines ... both widespread and deep."

Besides the establishment clause arguments, the Baptist Joint Committee brief directly attacked the government's assertion in the case that those



bringing suit do not have proper standing to do so because of presidential prerogatives in setting American foreign policy.

But Baker, acknowledging that Article II of the Constitution vests in the President the power to appoint and receive ambassadors, insisted nevertheless, "The President must exercise his powers . . . within the strictures" of the First Amendment.

Both sides in the dispute appear to agree that a key determination to be made by the courts is the question of whether the Vatican is essentially a sovereign nation-state or a religious body. Baker's statement to the district court takes issue with the government's position that renewed relations with the Vatican are those of one sovereign state with another.

To make his point, Baker cited an address last year by Archbishop Pio Laghi, Apostolic Pro-Nuncio—or ambassador—to the U.S., in which Laghi declared, "It is . . . the Pope's religious authority which confers upon him the classical right of legation, a diplomatic standing in the world." Laghi added: "Those who interpret Papal Diplomacy as emanating from the Pope's temporal sovereignty are failing to understand the true nature of the mission of the Holy See."

In its concluding section, the Baptist Joint Committee brief argued the new diplomatic relationship "seriously jeopardizes the missionary programs" of U.S.-based churches.

"Because of anti-American, anti-religious and anti-democratic sentiments in many of the developing countries," Baker wrote, "missionaries and other persons representing religious institutions could actually become symbols of American governmental interest." Such mingling of religious and national purposes potentially brought on by diplomatic relations with the Vatican "offers an occasion for misunderstanding, invites chaos and confusion, and places a burdensome albatross upon every American who represents religion overseas," Baker concluded. □

NCC critic says 'no' to cooperation with IRS

WASHINGTON

The Washington-based Institute on Religion and Democracy (IRD) has re-

fused to cooperate with an investigation of how the National Council of Churches has spent tax exempt contributions.

A spokesperson for IRD said that an IRS official contacted the group to ask for help in an investigation seeking to learn whether the NCC has used church funds for political purposes.

Although the institute is extremely critical of the church council, officials there refused to cooperate with the investigation by providing materials from its files concerning the body's use of tax exempt money.

Penn Kemble expressed concern that government intervention into church disputes "can only make real church reform difficult. Some of those who are abusing Christian stewardship will eagerly seize upon any IRS action to claim a kind of legal and political martyrdom for themselves."

The possible government action against the church council comes amid other attempts to counter religious lobbying against U.S. policies in Central America with challenges to tax exempt status of the groups involved. Between 1970 and 1981, the IRS conducted a long drawn-out audit (possibly for NCC opposition to the Vietnam War) which ended in finding that the council had not violated provisions of tax exemption. □

Secular Humanism rule draws sharp criticism

WASHINGTON

A proposed Education Department rule implementing a 1984 law which bars the use of earmarked federal funds in "magnet schools" to teach "secular humanism" has drawn criticism from several sources.

People for the American Way, an organization formed to counter activities of the religious right, told the department it should define the term if it wants to deny funds under the law which allocated \$75 million for magnet school grants.

Local school districts "face enough problems without having to wrestle with defining what, if anything, 'secular humanism' means," said People for the American Way executive director Anthony Podesta.

Meanwhile, a *Washington Post* editorial has criticized Congress for including the secular humanism ban in the

education law, despite the contention that no schools will be affected by the language.

The *Post* declared, "When federal aid to schools first began its great rise just 20 years ago, many conservatives feared that the money would become an 'irresistible vehicle for imposing political conditions and standards on local schools.'"

The editorial noted that "secular humanism" is used by many groups as a general designation of all that they most "dislike in the public school curriculum, from the theory of evolution to the literature of protest." □

Ervin chides Reagan over church-state relations

RALEIGH

Former Senator Sam Ervin in a letter scolded President Reagan and accused him of failing to understand separation of church and state.

Ervin chided the president for supporting a constitutional amendment allowing group prayer in public schools, for advocating tuition tax credits and for appointing a U.S. ambassador to the Vatican.

Ervin wrote, "what you say, do and advocate in respect to religion shows that you do not understand the religion clauses in the First Amendment, and how obedience to them is essential to the preservation of the religious freedom they are designed to secure to all Americans of all faiths." □

Driver's licensing case argued at High Court

WASHINGTON

A Nebraska woman who refused for reasons of conscience to be photographed for a driver's license and the state of Nebraska made their arguments to the U.S. Supreme Court Jan. 7 in a case of pitting competing governmental against individual interests.

Frances J. Quaring, whose attorney insisted before the high court that allowing her photograph to be made would violate the second of the Ten Commandments ("Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing . . ."), was denied a driver's license under a Nebraska law requiring the photo. □

Review Essay

Mark S. Caldwell

THE GREAT EVANGELICAL DISASTER

By Francis A. Schaeffer,
Westchester, IL: Crossway Books,
1984.

Francis Schaeffer's last book is to cultural and ecclesiastical criticism what Paul Harvey is to the news—simple, direct, and uncluttered by subtleties and ambiguities of any kind. For those who prefer MacNeill/Lehrer to Harvey, Schaeffer's book is itself a disaster filled with half-truths, and highly questionable historical analysis. What is simple to one becomes simplistic to the other.

Presumably a reasonably cogent criticism of our society and of the Church and even of the evangelical wing within the Church can be made. Schaeffer, however, has not made it. Typical of his approach is the conviction that the great evangelical disaster is "the failure of the evangelical world to stand for truth as truth." (p. 37) One wonders what it would be like for the evangelical world, or any other world for that matter, to stand for truth as error, or for error as truth. Schaeffer seems to prefer truth as half-truth or, perhaps better, half-truth as the whole truth. He does not deliver the goods.

The titanic freedoms which we in the U.S. once enjoyed have become cut loose in Schaeffer's view from Christian restraints and are becoming a force of destruction and chaos. All of this has happened in the short span of forty or so years from the twenties to the sixties. Now ours is a post-Christian world in which Christianity is no longer the consensus of our society (pp. 28-29). One wonders what was notably Christian about the 1920's, or the 1890's, or the 1860's, or the 1740's, for that matter? Did this so-called Christian consensus have to do with slavery, or bathtub gin, or the flapper era, or robber barons on Wall Street, or with male voters and black servants? Just exactly what was it about these earlier eras in our history that made them more Christian than our own? Concerning this, we are left somewhat to our imagination, but not entirely.

Schaeffer seems determined to find the retreat from Biblical inerrancy as the foundation of all modern problems, both ecclesiastical and social. Yet

in his attack he confuses Karl Barth with Existentialism, neo-orthodoxy with the thought of Friedrich Schleiermacher in the early 19th Century. Then he uses Martin Luther as an example for the correct view of scriptural appreciation, failing conveniently to mention that Luther thought very little of the book of James. In these and in other ways too numerous to mention, Schaeffer discredits much of his own argument.

The turning point in the demise of a Christian culture occurred, in Schaeffer's view, in the mid-1930's during the Fundamentalist-Liberal controversy that wracked particularly the Presbyterian Church with which Schaeffer is more familiar. His view for what happened during that time is "accommodation." The evangelical church apparently "accommodated" to the world's spirit and set in motion the retreat from a Christian society. The basic element in this accommodation was the retreat from Biblical inerrancy. Schaeffer remarks, "Up until the last two hundred years or so virtually every Christian believed in the complete inerrancy of the Bible or in the equivalent of this expressed in similar terms." (p. 45) This is simply not the case. Aside from the obvious fact that there was no generally accepted New Testament canon prior to the late fourth century A.D., various methods of interpretation have dotted the Church's landscape over the centuries. Of course, Schaeffer may want to deny the term Christian to those who have espoused other interpretations. Belief in inerrancy has been, and remains, tangential to Christian commitment and discipleship.

John A. Broadus (1827-1895) was a distinguished Baptist preacher, teacher, scholar, and denominational statesman. He was one of the famous "Four Founding Fathers" of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY. In his work, "A Catechism of Bible Teaching," Broadus wrote, "Does the Bible contain any errors? The Bible records some things said by uninspired men that were not true; but it is true and instructive that these men said them. What authority has the Bi-

ble for us? The Bible is our only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice." Broadus' position offers far more hope for serious and committed Bible students than does the inerrancy espoused by Schaeffer.

Schaeffer continues, "Thus it is important to note that up until recent times (1) belief in the inerrancy of scripture even when it was not practiced fully and (2) claiming to be a Christian were seen as two things which necessarily went together." (p. 45) One simply does not know what this means. What does it mean to say, "Belief in the inerrancy of scripture even when it was not practiced fully?" How does one practice inerrancy in the first place? Furthermore, Schaeffer seems to be saying that people believed in the inerrancy of scripture but not entirely. If so, he is saying that people believed in inerrancy, but did not believe in inerrancy. The fact is, one is either an inerrantist or one is not, just as one is pregnant or one is not. For example, Schaeffer believes in inerrancy, and I do not.

To make his case against the modern Church, Schaeffer becomes involved in a tortured explanation of how neo-orthodoxy is really liberalism and how both are essentially existentialism. In doing so he confuses Barth with classical Liberalism. As a matter of fact, Karl Barth wrote his *Church Dogmatics* in opposition to the prevailing liberalism of his day. In addition, he first wrote *Christian Dogmatics* and then re-wrote it and re-entitled it *Church Dogmatics* because he felt his first effort was influenced too much by existentialism. Typical of Schaeffer's historical guilt by association is his phrase, "Neibühr-Tillich-God is dead" syndrome and his remark that "neo-orthodoxy leads to a dead-end and a dead God as has already been demonstrated by the theology of the sixties." (p. 53) Such historical inaccuracies literally dot this entire work. At points such as this Schaeffer seems to be almost a cheerleader for certain so-called evangelical, or even fundamentalist interests. One gets the impression that this manuscript was obtained by several taped interviews with the author.

"Quoted in *A Baptist Treasury*, edited by Syndor Stealer, NY: Thomas Y. Cowell Co., 1958, P. 63.

Dr. Caldwell is pastor of University Baptist Church, College Park, Md.

Presumably, had he had the opportunity to review the text sufficiently Schaeffer would have tightened up his arguments significantly. If, because of his illness and subsequent death, he was unable to do so, we could have hoped that an editor would have made important corrections in the manuscript before publishing it.

If Schaeffer wanted to criticize the Church and the world, he need have looked no further than the spreading virus of civil religion which threatens to erupt into a major epidemic in our time. What we see today is not unlike that which the Biblical prophets saw in the eighth century B.C.—a growing reliance on priestly civil religion used by politicians and church persons to curry favor with the people and with our national leaders. This type of religion is the smallest common denominator kind, a watered down faith that equates God and country, wraps itself simultaneously in the flag and the Bible and blurs the difference between the two. God is not asked to judge our nation, but to bless our national agenda. Schaeffer's myopic inerrantist vision blinds him to this impeding crisis.

An increasingly virulent strain of the deadly American priestly civil religion is abroad in the land. God, in fact, is in danger of being enshrined as an American tribal deity as the recent political

campaign so ably demonstrated. The Bible is very plain about this danger. One preoccupied as Schaeffer is with the inerrancy issue may indeed miss it as has Schaeffer.

The evangelical disaster is not the retreat from inerrancy, but the confusion of faith in the Bible with the faith of the Bible. The official or semi-official alliance of the evangelical wing of the Church with the current political administration is the true impending disaster facing us. Perhaps we are on the brink of making the mistake Israel made in the eighth century B.C., that is assuming God's blessing on our schemes, his unquestioned support for our causes, his unconditional endorsement of our pursuit of wealth, power, and the so-called good life. Perhaps God must be thinking, "Well, here we go again. Will they never learn? Will my people constantly be duped by political figures who use my name in vain to wrap my Word in their flags, and by preachers who confuse their own kingdom building with my kingdom, who confuse their words with my Word." We should not be misled by the similar messages heard from the eighth century prophets and from Francis Schaeffer. Both do call for a return to a kind of old-time religion and to traditional values. The Biblical prophets seek to return the children of Israel to the covenant of Sinai, filled as it was

with moral obligations and with a call to become a light to the nations. Schaeffer apparently wants us to return to a simpler theological time. The moral dimension of his memory seems missing, though in the latter part of his book he at least gives some expression to moral issues. The prophets say, "Remember." Schaeffer says, "Remember." But what the prophet remembers, Schaeffer forgets, and what Schaeffer remembers, the prophets condemn.

We are left wondering about all those evangelical Christians who, in Schaeffer's view, have left the true fold to become moderates instead of fundamentalists. In this regard, Schaeffer's book gives me some cause for hope. As a Southern Baptist seemingly surrounded on all sides these days by Bible-waving inerrantists, I am comforted to learn that Schaeffer sees himself surrounded on all sides by moderates who want to be thought of as fundamentalists. Could it be that those of the Fundamentalist political party could actually be crypto-moderates who really don't believe what they say? I hope Schaeffer is right. For this reason and this reason alone I find *The Great Evangelical Disaster* a hopeful book. Otherwise, taken as a serious study of the Church and cultural criticism *The Great Evangelical Disaster* is itself a disaster. □

We have had recurring eras of arrogance in our history and we seem to be on the verge of another. One who sees America from abroad notices the arrogance more clearly than he who stays at home. The strident, scolding voice that reaches the shores of other nations is not the voice of the warmhearted America that we love. America seen from abroad is rich and arrogant. She is great in military prowess but often weak in principle. The arrogance we feel at home reflects in part the uneasiness of the rich who are surrounded by slums and know not what to do but police them. The psychology of fear and apprehension produces the radical Right. From that vantage point "revolution" is a subversive word; even those who want to help the people of the slums to find within themselves the power to improve their own lot are "dangerous." Yet the world needs "revolution" as never before, if the technological age is to have spiritual and humane, as well as materialistic, values. □

William O. Douglas
The Center Magazine



We must continue to support the great and noble causes — the public schools, among them. Second only to the work of the preacher, the work of the public school teacher is the most prominent thing happening in America today. We have 40 million of our young citizens going to the nation's public elementary and secondary schools. People may despair about some of the things that are going on in these schools. Schools are imperfect, they are made up of human beings. Churches, businesses, families are imperfect. We can't stand perfection, and the only thing we did with perfection was to crucify him.

Christian people are teaching school and [in them] we have good influence. One of my dear pastor friends and I

were talking about this and he said, "Things aren't perfect at school. What should we do, how can we start a private school?" I said, "Don't start one. Run for the school board. Get in there and take care of it." Don't bail out on something as significant as the public school. That is the most important social effort in the history of mankind except for God's work in the Church. The American public school is unique and it needs our support. Like other good things, including democracy, which can stand debate and criticism, the public school cannot survive without citizen support. □

Arthur Mallory
Commissioner of Education
State of Missouri

I am not a Bonhoeffer scholar, but it is apparent that few criticized more roundly than he those who would use religion as a crutch. Rejecting traditional religiosity, he called for an activist Christian involvement in the world.

Continued on page 14.



INTERNATIONAL DATELINE

So. Africa security chief calls for arrest of Boesak

The minister of security of the South Africa government called for the arrest of the Rev. Allan Boesak, a leader in the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, and president of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

The government threat reportedly came after Dr. Boesak, the 36-year-old mixed-race leader of the Dutch Reformed mission church in South Africa, made a speech in Australia on police brutality in South Africa. Louis LaGrange, minister of security, announced he was calling for the attorney general to prepare papers to file charges against Dr. Boesak because of comments in the speech.

Meanwhile, the Presbyterian Church (USA) has asked the prime minister of South Africa, Pieter Botha, to use his influence to halt the government's investigation of Dr. Boesak. The Presbyterian body, the largest U.S. member of the international Reformed organization, acted in response to reports that Dr. Boesak was being charged under "Section 27," the "Police Act."

Presbyterian church officials originally said Dr. Boesak was threatened because of remarks made in a speech. But later the denomination said Dr. Boesak had reportedly violated the act by remarks he made in an interview with a reporter for an Australian newspaper during a visit to that country.

He was reportedly quoted by the *Sydney Morning Herald* as saying that the South African police were committing "the most unbelievable atrocities," and was said to have described the South African Defense Force as "one of the most sophisticated murder machines in history."

Presbyterian officials in Atlanta said their World Alliance sources indicated that Dr. Boesak's remarks in Sydney had been misquoted in South Africa. □

Jewish USSR immigration lowest since 1965

The number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union fell below 1,000 for the first time last year, two monitoring agencies announced here.

The National Conference on Soviet

Jewry and the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry said the figure for 1984 was only 896. Last year, the total was 1,314, which at that time was the smallest number since the Soviet Jewry movement began keeping statistics in 1965.

Soviet authorities assert that all Jews who have applied for exit visas have received them. But Mr. Kronish and Morris B. Abram, chairman of the National Conference, said that 20,000 of the more than 350,000 Soviet Jews who have taken steps to emigrate have been officially turned down by authorities. They estimated that there are between 2.5 million and 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union.

In a *Christian Science Monitor* article, Dimitri Simes noted that at the meetings in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union, the U.S. connection between emigration and trade is "an objective reality established by the American political process." U.S. leaders rejected the standard Soviet reply that "the alleged virtual embargo on emigration is a myth and emigration does exist" □

Bishop Tutu lauds NCC for support in So. Africa

Bishop Desmond Tutu, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, told leaders of the National Council of Churches here that the churches should be "an audiovisual aid to show the world what God intends the human community to be like."

The black Anglican cleric, who heads the South African Council of Churches, spoke at an installation service for new officers of the NCC.

Noting the support the NCC has given to him in his work with the South African church council, he said, "It is exhilarating to know yourself to be held by the prayers and love of so many around the world. It is really a physical sensation of being surrounded by love and caring."

Rejecting the label of "courageous" that many have attached to his name, the bishop observed: "When God takes you by the scruff of the neck, you have had it. It has very little to do with personal courage. It has everything to do with belonging to the church of God."



Apartheid in South Africa would come to an end "tomorrow" if President Reagan would say to Prime Minister Botha, "You've had it! Unless you end all bannings, detentions, and nationalizing of blacks, the cover we have given you against the hostility of the world will be lifted.

"We in South Africa are able to witness as we witness," he said, "because you are faithful in your witness here."

UN calls for guarantees for religious tolerance

UNITED NATIONS

Calling for constitutional guarantees and legislative reforms aimed at protecting religious freedoms, a United Nations "Seminar on the Encouragement of Religious Tolerance" urged governments to protect the rights of believers.

Sponsored by the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, the two-week session in Geneva ended with a call to states to re-examine their legislation and to study the possibility of establishing educational programs encouraging respect and tolerance for religion.

Seminar recommendations included urging governments to implement U.N. standards for religious rights, especially the 1981 "Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief."

By consensus the conference concludes that "tolerance, understanding and respect for religion or other belief



NEWS-SCAN

were essential for living in peace ... freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief was a fundamental right to be guaranteed to all without discrimination."

In one of the more vigorous speeches that preceded the seminar, Vincenza Lomonaco of Italy, pointed out that the "ancient plague" of intolerance still survives in many regions. She called specifically for the education of pre-school children to reject prejudices.

With its themes of "peace, participation, and development," the International Youth Year, 1985, proclaimed by the UN will be celebrated by Baptist young people of Europe. The executive body of the European Baptist Federation Youth Committee has offered suggestions for practical application of the themes.

Walter Fauntroy, Black Baptist pastor and the elected Delegate for the District of Columbia in Congress, was honored by the UN's Special Committee against Apartheid with a symbolic Nelson Mandela coin.

The presentation was made in recognition of Fauntroy's role as a resister to apartheid. He was one of the first to be arrested in peaceful demonstrations near the South African embassy in Washington, DC.

The UN General Assembly has once again called for the "immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan," and reiterated that Afghanistan must achieve a "non-aligned character" if there is to be a long-term peaceful solution of its problems. □ (Carl Tiller)

Church can fire teacher because of lifestyle

MONTREAL

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that a Roman Catholic teacher whose lifestyle did not conform to her church's canon laws could be fired by the Catholic school commission for which she worked.

The court, in a unanimous decision, dismissed an appeal by Margaret Caldwell, a teacher at the St. Thomas Aquinas High School in North Vancouver, B.C., who was dismissed after

she married a divorced Methodist. The school, supported by church authorities, said the "scandal" of the marriage to a divorced man made her unfit to teach Catholic students.

Ms. Caldwell had challenged the school's action as illegal because job discrimination based on religion and marital status is prohibited under the British Columbia Human Rights Code.

Backed by the B.C. Human Rights Commission, Ms. Caldwell carried her suit to the Supreme Court of Canada. She asked the court to rule whether Catholic school boards could be tougher on Catholic teachers than on non-Catholics. The high court said the board was justified in dismissing teachers in such situations. □

Israeli woman convicted; lied to evade army service

HAIFA

A 21-year-old woman has been convicted of falsely claiming that she was observant to Judaism to evade army service.

Sabrina Ben-Simon told military officers that she observed Jewish dietary laws and does not travel on the Sabbath. The army later discovered that she violates the religious injunction against Sabbath travel.

Women are included in the country's military draft of Israelis 18 years and over, but religious women have not been compelled to serve in the army.

For years, Israeli women who sought to stay out of the army by declaring they were religiously observant were kept under surveillance for verification of their religious lifestyle. With the advent of the governments of Prime Minister Menachem Begin in 1977, the practice slowly ceased. □

Mormons sued over satellite dish

MONTREAL

A Mormon church in the Montreal suburb of Kirkland is being sued by the municipality for refusing to remove a satellite antenna receiving "dish" which it used to pick up religious broadcasts from the United States.

Receiving dishes more than six feet above ground and located in residential areas violate a by-law. □

Kim Dae Jung, exiled South Korean opposition leader, plans to return home early in February, but will take precaution to avoid the fatal reception accorded Benigno Aquino when that opposition leader disembarked at a Philippine airport. Kim plans to be accompanied by a foreign delegation, among them the former U.S. assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, Pat Derian, to witness his arrival. In 1982, Kim's 20-year sentence for "sedition" was suspended. . . . Congregations of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists baptized 7,475 converts during 1980-1983. Since 1980, Baptists have registered 76 new churches and church groups and have built or acquired 118 prayer houses (church buildings). The report also notes that "152 brothers were ordained as pastors and 229 persons as deacons" . . . Church-state relations in Spain have evolved to the point where Baptists are permitted to engage in hospital ministry that includes worship services and visiting patients. The Luis Alcanyes Hospital is only the first to permit such ministry, but Xativa Baptist Church Pastor Ruben Gomez declared: "Now that an end has come for our excuses of discrimination and persecution, we will see if Spanish Baptists know how to take advantage of the favorable circumstances" . . . An open letter from a former Soviet psychiatric patient, a prisoner of conscience, says "The western public has a real chance of freeing victims of psychiatric abuse within one and a half to two years of confinement in a special psychiatric hospital and within only six months' confinement in an ordinary hospital." He says "The key to success is being methodical and persistent." Each victim of psychiatric abuse must be the special concern of several groups—the opinions of the prisoners' relatives count for very little and those of the prisoner not at all, according to the letter to Amnesty International. The former prisoner of conscience, who still lives in the Soviet Union and understandably remains anonymous, was "adopted" by AI. □

CORRESPONDENCE

Reader response extends dialogue and thereby helps to focus and clarify the issues. Letters must carry both signature and address of the writer and should not exceed 200 words. We reserve the right to edit for length.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs should be commended for its leadership in developing guidelines for implementation of the "Equal Access Act."

The committee's work ensures access to public school facilities for voluntary, extra-curricular religious activities while giving public schools some protection against abuse of the access privilege by neo-Nazis, the KKK, satanic cults and other such groups.

The committee had the wisdom, patience and skill to reason together with the proponents and opponents of equal access in order to avoid the havoc which the statute might otherwise have created.

Many of us may have preferred that the equal access issue had never come up. Clearly, the debate over "voluntary" school prayer (from which the equal access debate developed), is not yet put to rest. Once the issue did arise; however, I am proud that the committee stepped in and provided such commendable leadership.

David R. Bragg
Austin, TX



• **Mark Caldwell** believes that the inerrantist controversy camouflages the real issue, that of watered-down faith due to a blurring of church and state, faith and patriotism claims. What recent actions in your area tend to support that view, in light of historic Baptist faith and its emphasis upon religious liberty?

• **Larry Greenfield** claims to "out-Baptist" his fellow Baptists regarding the Equal Access Act passed by Congress in 1984. Whatever good the legislation promotes, he says the law violates the Constitution because it has the potential to regulate and monitor religious practice. How has Congress sanctioned the "establishment of religion," and how might Greenfield's views affect churches which find it

VIEWS, from page 6

church-state law. He will be looking for nominees who won't "coddle" criminals, who will continue to approve of capital punishment and will seek a return to the days when most criminals had virtually no hope of having their cases heard by the highest court in the land.

So where does that leave church-state questions at the high court in the post-Reagan era? For now, as uncomfortable as it makes advocates of church-state separation, that is an unanswerable question. □

nay, from page 5.

To say "Aye" to that question and "Nay" to the Equal Access Act may derive from a severe case of Baptist petulance. Maybe my reasons are indeed only rationalizations to cover such perversity. Possibly we need to be pro-religion-in-the-public-sphere on a few occasions, if only to surprise ourselves and others, or to create some unity and goodwill within the family and among our neighbors. It could be that when the bulldog doesn't growl or bark, it is just an assuring sign that the critter has some discernment. If all of this is so, I beg forgiveness for spoiling an all-too-rare occurrence of Baptist unity.

But I still say "Nay." □

necessary to rent public property for a time to conduct services?

• In a *Ripon Forum* conversation, **Donald Shriver** says he has no objection to people trying to correlate their political philosophies with their faith beliefs. But at the same time he "fears the identification of Gospel truth with political truth of any kind." What about the problems/dangers and their effect on church state relations? What can Shriver possibly mean when he says the church can give to American politics, "prayer", but also "its own images of the world through international human contacts and appropriate use of media communication ..."

• **James Dunn** sees linkages among our freedoms because of the "Divine in us all." Thus, *freedom from* want relates naturally to the *freedom to worship*, and provides impetus for a great deal of mission outreach in the context of a "both/and" outreach. Recall some biblical cornerstones, words of Jesus, that add integrity to the political guarantees that are concerned with freedom issues. □

Order Form

REGISTER CITIZEN OPINION

Updated to reflect changes that have taken place through the 1984 national elections, and includes all committee assignments in the 99th Congress.

Single copies 75 cents postpaid; 10 for \$4.00 postpaid; 100 for \$35.00 postpaid; and 1000 for \$230.00 plus shipping.

EQUAL ACCESS GUIDELINES

Guidelines for The Equal Access Act are now available. Several religious and civil rights groups—not all of whom supported the Act—drew up these guidelines for implementing it in accordance with law. For a single copy send a stamped, self-addressed envelope with your request. In quantity: 10 for \$1.00; 100 copies for \$8.50; one-thousand for \$75.00, plus postage.

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

- Single subscription \$6.00 per year
- Single subscription, 2 years \$11.00
- Club rate (10 or more) \$5.00 each
May be sent to separate addresses)
- Student rate \$2.50 per year
- Student rate, 2 years \$4.00
(Must be accompanied by payment)
- Foreign, please add \$2.00 postage

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

_____ Payment Enclosed
2/85 _____ Bill Me

Precisely the spark of the Divine in us all that prompts awe and adoration is the flame worth guarding and defending in every person . . .

REFLECTIONS

James M. Dunn
Executive Director



Why do you suppose some Christians are a tad uncomfortable with phrases like "the right to food" or "freedom from hunger?"

On January 6, 1941 Franklin D. Roosevelt set out the "four freedoms" in a message to Congress. One might quibble with the order in which he named them. "The first is freedom of speech and expression . . . (T)he second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way . . . (T)he third is freedom from want . . . (T)he fourth is freedom from fear." Or, one could fuss with the relatively narrow expression "freedom of worship" rather than a more inclusive concept such as "freedom of religion," but these "essential human freedoms" were enthusiastically applauded and accepted in this nation. They became a slogan for our side in the great conflict. As goals they were seen as universally valid and were to be pursued "everywhere in the world."

Since that time over 40 years ago we have seen an increasing gap between our understanding of political freedom and economic freedom. This is true partly because some such distinction exists and partly because of the emphasis in the West on individual rights, personal liberties and political freedom, and in the planned economies (at least their rhetoric), on the priority of material well-being.

Somehow we need to reaffirm the inexorable connection between freedom from want and freedom to worship. Precisely the spark of the Divine in us all that prompts awe and adoration is the flame worth guarding and defending in every person. The poignant recognition that "nothing human is alien to me" makes me care about the victims of mass starvation anywhere in the world and it also moves me to intense indignation at the thought of religious liberty for anyone being limited or denied.

Christians embraced Roosevelt's "four freedoms" but not because he backed his proclamation with biblical proof texts. There is no evidence that the charismatic wartime leader deliberately appealed to theological argument or consciously came to the "four freedoms" from a Christian perspective.

Yet, there was and is something that rings true in the affirmation and the linkage of such seemingly disparate values: freedom from fear, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom of speech, indeed! What triggered that mix? What right did the President of the United States have to formulate and proclaim them by fiat?

Some of us see the person of God as source of all human freedom. Because God is person and not mere principle, because our personhood is in some way rooted in the personality of the One Jesus called "Father," and because in ways beyond understanding we even replicate the Creator of the universe all liberty flows from religious liberty. Being made like God is the only substantial clue we have for interpreting the human hunger for freedom.

Freedom from want as well as freedom of worship relates to the *imago Dei*. Julius K. Nyerere, President of Tanzania pled this point, "We say man was created in the

image of God. I refuse to imagine a God who is miserable, poor, ignorant, superstitious, fearful, oppressed and wretched — which is the lot of the majority of those He created in His own image."

Jesus' inaugural address begins with these words: "The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor." (Luke 4:18)

Fortunately we do not have to choose between the war on hunger and the struggle for human rights. We can not set aside our dedication to helping the starving until we have brought to oppressed peoples guarantees of political freedom. Americans have offered massive testimony to their understanding of this fact with the outpouring of aid for Ethiopians.

Happily we do not need to put preaching the good news (missions and evangelism) on hold until we have met immediate emergency relief needs. Sharing the "bread of life" goes along with sharing bread for life.

Biblically we have no business waiting until we have converted suffering peoples to our ways of thinking before we respond from our plenty to their need. The book of Matthew, Chapter 25, categorically rules out the use of food as a weapon.

Historically Roger Williams demonstrated that he cared passionately for the native Americans and their physical needs. Yet, no figure in Colonial America stands taller than Williams as a champion of religious freedom. Roger Williams is a great model for "getting it all together." He held unwavering commitments to social justice and to personal freedom.

Contemporary Christians must engage in both the pursuit of political freedom providing individual rights on one hand and economic justice meeting basic human needs on the other hand. The biblical revelation calls us to be "both/and" not "either/or" persons.

The Right, so-called, tends to act as if life were lived in a classical history textbook with the forces of good (us) and evil (them) locked in mortal struggle for the souls of *men* (sic), sick. The Left, leftover liberalism, swallows whole the Marxist analysis, class conflict, economic determination and approaches life as if sweeping economic reform would bring salvation. To the degree that our belief in freedom is grounded in the Gospel, not in political ideology or economic self-interest, we will reject both Right and Left as extremes, as incomplete explanations, as unworthy causes.

The Christian perspective cares about whole persons and rejects the notion that fighting for personal freedom and accepting social responsibility are contradictory. In fact, if either is genuine the other is implied. Love lumps together those four freedoms even as Roosevelt did.

We do not need to be nervous preaching the "four freedoms." They still fit the American dream and the Christian conscience. □

REVIEWS



WALKING ON THORNS

The Call to Christian Obedience

By Allan Boesak

William B. Erdmans Publishing Co.,
Grand Rapids, MI, 65 pp., Paper,
\$3.95.

I have discovered that obedience to God in the situation in which so many South Africans live is not the result of a decision one makes once for all. It is a commitment that needs to be renewed every day. I have also discovered something else: the love God has for us, and which enables us to love God, liberates us for obedience, for the joy of freedom, the freedom to be freed from that fear of the cruel and violent people who know only the language of enslavement, intimidation and violence. It is not all a heavy, joyless burden, neither is it that sweet, suffocating social masochism that so many Christians have displayed over so many centuries. It is a joy that affirms life, to such an extent that those who really knew what they were talking about caught its spirit in a spiritual:

... And before I'll be a slave
I'll be buried in my grave
And go home to my Lord and be
free! □

COMMENT

..... continued from page 11.

"It is not abstract argument, but concrete example," Bonhoeffer argued in *Prisoner of God*, which gives the church's word "emphasis and power."

My own view is that the politician who pontificates the most about religion is the one who should be watched the closest by the body politic. What matters most is not what one exhorts others to do but how one lives one's own life.

Instead of interpreting scripture for fellow citizens, politicians should more

properly busy themselves with following it themselves. A good place to begin would be for everyone in Washington to re-read the prophet Isaiah's exhortation to beat swords into plowshares. Otherwise a cynical public might conclude that the debate about abortion and school prayer is a diversion from the real issue of our times. □

Jim Leach

U.S. House of Representatives

Reading our daily papers and weekly journals and listening to the political pitch-men of the past few weeks, it is apparent that record deficits, import and export quotas and imbalances, the money supply, the gross national product, taxes, revenue enhancement, inflation, interest rates, profit and loss statements, bankruptcies, the Dow Jones averages, the rise and fall of the dollar, prime rates, and net worth are the language of America.

It is evident ... that everything other than the state of the economy (with the possible exception of the abortion issue) is being relegated to the category of the unimportant.

If the Marxists are criticized for their obsession with economic determination as a principle for the interpretation of all human behavior, it behooves us who still believe that human spirit is more than the sum of its economic parts, to evidence concerns ... that have to do with something beyond the state of the economy. If we are to be faithful to the full range of discipleship to One who made himself of no reputation that we might know life, and know it abundantly, we must reject any notion that subsumes either our politics or our religion to the rule of gold which is a far cry from the golden rule!

The tragedy is that the God Mamon is not dead, he is alive and well, and few there are who will not bow a knee or two to his dominion. □

E. Spencer Parsons
"The Economic American"

We start from the premise that the Court did decide in 1962 that vocal prayer in schools is unconstitutional and that's simply not the issue here. It's not one of the questions presented, not one of the issues that the Court is going to decide. Rather it is simply going to decide, given that vocal prayer is unconstitutional, what about a moment of silence? It's not silent prayer. It's a moment of silence where everyone is silent and can use that moment for whatever purpose he or she wishes. □

Rex E. Lee

U.S. Solicitor General



FREE! Religious Liberty Packet

SOUL
FREEDOM

Baptists
Living their Biblical Faith

Religious Liberty Day—June 1985

Send today for an attractive poster and other materials to assist your church in developing a Religious Liberty Day emphasis. No charge.

Name _____
Church _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs
205 Maryland Ave. NE Washington, DC 20002

2U180 TONATJ K
A. RONALD TONKS
HISTORICAL COMM.
127 NINTH AVE., N.
NASHVILLE, TN.

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Riverdale, MD
Permit No. 5061

37234