

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Fraternal / Baptist Ministers Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bmj-06.php

The Fraternal

July, 1970

No. 157

| | |
|---|----|
| EDITORIAL | 4 |
| THEOLOGY IN THE 1970s | 5 |
| Rev. Neville Clark, M.A., S.T.M., Minister, Amersham. | |
| THE CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL SCENE—I | 10 |
| Rev. Eric C. Rust, M.A., B.D., M.Sc., Litt.D., Professor of Christian Philosophy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A. | |
| SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE | 19 |
| Rev. L. H. Brockington, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Aramaic and Syriac, University of Oxford. | |
| YOUTH IN FURTHER EDUCATION | 23 |
| Rev. Maurice F. Williams, M.A., M.Th., Minister, Beechen Grove, Watford | |
| CHRISTIANITY AND MEDICAL ETHICS | 27 |
| Professor J. T. Aitken, M.D., Professor of Anatomy, University College, London. | |
| JEW AND ARAB IN THE HOLY LAND | 35 |
| Rev. Ernest Willmott, Secretary, Spurgeon's College, London. | |
| ABOUT BOOKS: IMPORTANT CITIZENSHIP PUBLICATIONS | 41 |
| Rev. Donald D. Black, M.A., B.D., Christian Citizenship Department, Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. | |
| RETIREMENT HOMES FOR MINISTERS, MISSIONARIES OR OTHER ELDERLY BAPTISTS | 44 |
| Mr Robert G. Brown, F.C.I.S., F.B.S., Executive Vice-Chair- man, Baptist Men's Movement Housing Association. | |
| OF INTEREST TO YOU | 45 |
| OVERSEAS NOTES | 48 |

EDITORIAL

An article in the present issue takes up the theme of theology in the 70s. Another subject likely to need attention in the 70s is worship, and some of the problems in this field are beginning to show themselves. Our thinking in this matter does not differ from other denominations in being largely minister-dominated but it is different from some in the degree of freedom which each minister has to follow his individual "insights". But in our tradition as a whole worship has been a neglected subject and many of us would admit that for "insights" it would often be appropriate to read "blind spots".

This makes us more than usually vulnerable in the present situation. We are in a period when church life as a whole, and worship itself, is coming under scrutiny and revision. There are some, for example, who claim that the house-church is not simply one form of the local church's life but the new focus of it, and they have no use for a central place of worship. Some who have no doubt about the need for a focal gathering of the whole church are nevertheless looking for changed emphases. Our worship, they say, is too middle-class; it must become multi-cultural if it is to be appropriate for a multi-cultural society.

No doubt by the end of the 70s many experiments will have been tried and found wanting while some changes will have established themselves, perhaps imperceptibly, perhaps dramatically. Changes are going on now. Observe, for example, how since the advent of the new Hymn Book, our churches which are not often very good chanting have taken happily to the use of the responsive reading. In some churches dialogue occasionally replaces the sermon and certainly more are willing to provide opportunities for come-back after the sermon, in the form of questions and discussion.

Two points may be mentioned among a number that will need to be watched. The first relates to the kind of difficulty which inevitably attends a transition period. Can the traditional and the radically new co-exist? Perhaps we shall have to make them do so. But if traditional forms are strange to newcomers the change to a new idiom is often equally hard for older people, among them some of our most loyal members. Nor is their uneasiness always grounded in sentiment alone. While the old hymns may have been steeped in the language of Zion and may sound obsolete, some of the new ones are trite in the extreme. Their words and music could well be as ephemeral as most of the products of the pop-age. This sort of thing may have to have a place to match the mood of the time but let us recognise that for many it does not contribute to the diet of worship. There will be need of tolerance and give-and-take. Those whose responsibility it is to lead in worship will need much understanding and sensitivity.

It is also timely to remind ourselves that there are basic principles and basic elements in Christian worship. These are indeed capable of varied expression, but they are not to be forgotten or neglected except at serious cost. This is a sphere

in which all too often we act pragmatically instead of being guided by a worthy theology. The candy-floss of bright ideas is but a poor exchange for controlling principles of worship. A few years ago we were beginning to think about these things. If the 70s are going to bring changes, the need for a fundamental understanding of what we are doing in worship is even more urgent. We may be living through a revolution but there are stars to steer by and we should use them.

THEOLOGY IN THE 1970s

To be asked to write on this theme is to be confronted with temptation. How wonderful an opportunity to gain some slight reputation for omniscience. Out with the crystal ball, and let prophecy commence! Men want to know what is or will be the theology for this decade. They must not be disappointed.

If the temptation is here resisted, it is unashamedly for two quite simple reasons. In this field, the most inspired hunch is likely to be proved wrong. Daily I live with my miscalculations. I have no desire to live with them in print. Further, the only tolerably certain judgment that can be made is that no "leading" theology is emerging or is likely to emerge. The theological scene is in rare confusion—a fact that some find exciting and some depressing. Either way, the mists promise to thicken rather than clear. We are in a somewhat barren wilderness, with not overmuch manna today and only hopes for tomorrow. And the scouts are still wrangling about the direction of the Promised Land.

So it may be wisdom to undertake a more modest and unassuming task. Those who live in the midst of the theological disorder will need to take some bearings, if they are going to survive. What are the pressures that prompted this disarray? What are the roads that led to the present impasse? What are the issues around which battle must rage? Where are the glimpses of firmer ground? Such daunting terrain may partially be plotted via discussion of three basic questions. In shorthand form they may be labelled the question of history, the question of meaning, and the question of social action.

The emergence in the nineteenth century of the historical-critical method of enquiry wrecked traditional theology. For it marked not merely the appearance of some new and useful technique but rather a decisive and revolutionary shift in human consciousness. Here the representative and significant figure is Troeltsch. He glimpsed the magnitude of the transformation and flung out the challenges with which contemporary theology still struggles.

It might seem serious enough that historical enquiry appeared irresistibly to undermine the imposing traditional construction of God's activity in history, tearing in pieces the infallibility of scripture, and suggesting that the halo round the head of Jesus of Nazareth had been placed there years later by the Early Church. Yet such shattering conclusions could still be resisted by advancing an imposing defence counter in the form of an appeal to a "sane and sober criticism". What had finally to be faced were problems of a much more profound nature.

For the new historical understanding made relativity the mark of the modern consciousness. Events formed a chain stretching through time and space. They were all of a piece. Historical investigation proceeded and must proceed on the assumption of a uniform framework, so that a basis of comparison is possible between the human experience of the present and the world of the past. And at the end of the search what emerges has inevitably and at best the status of probability, never of certainty. Therefore, while allowance can rightly and must necessarily be made for that which is particular, different, unusual, unexpected, there is no place and can be no place for the absolute, the unique, the incomparable.

Here then was the dilemma. Christianity claimed to be an historical Faith. What was to happen if history and belief were at variance? Could men have it both ways? How was the absoluteness of the claim to be reconciled with the relativity of the foundation? Was belief dependent upon its historical base? Could the results of historical enquiry menace belief? The problem was starkly posed in connection with Jesus the Christ. What was the relationship between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith?

The theological solutions offered were many. The divine action was located in a sort of sacred history, confined in scripture, intersecting ordinary history, somehow lying outside the familiar nexus of cause and effect. A distinction was drawn between history as past event to be probed, assessed, established, and history as present meaning, challenging the enquirer's self-understanding; between history as scientifically verifiable and history as existentially relevant. The historical Jesus was no part of faith's requirement, and no historical verdict could touch the certainty of belief. Enquiry into the historical basis of the Christian Faith could validate belief when it was conducted with "proper" presuppositions . . . The permutations and combinations were endless. Yet no generally satisfying conclusion has been reached. The sixties hand on the problem unsolved to the seventies.

Meanwhile, the same revolution in the human consciousness which had thrust forward the problem of history had also thrown up the problem of meaning. Not only was the credibility of the Christian Faith in question. So also was its intelligibility. Theology has always been engaged in the struggle to be at one and the same time truly christian and truly contemporary. It cannot capitulate to the culture, for then it

would cease to be christian. Yet it can only speak to men when it effectively relates to contemporary experience. When it fails at this point, it ceases to be intelligible.

For a time, neo-orthodox theology operated quite brilliantly in presenting a Faith that could claim to speak realistically to the human situation in its greatness and misery. The tremendous biblical realities could be commended as offering to the human predicament possibilities of illumination and transformation beyond any provided by other contemporary options. They did justice to the complexities of man's experience. They explained his frustrations and undergirded his hopes.

This whole theological enterprise took as its starting point the "given" of revelation—however diversely that "given" might be interpreted. The theologian played the biblical understanding like a searchlight upon the darkness of the secular scene, and things took shape and began to fall into meaningful patterns. But it is precisely this procedure that has become suspect. It is exactly at this point that theology has sustained blows that threaten to prove mortal. For the great biblical symbols have been steadily losing meaning, and the language of faith has become progressively more unintelligible.

At one level, this problem was underlined by Language Philosophy. No longer was it thought possible to engage in philosophy with a view to reaching after reality. The humbler task of analysing language was the only proper goal. What was the meaning of religious language? Did talk about God really say anything? Were the christian assertions strictly nonsensical? Here was a fundamental challenge to every theological position.

The gauntlet was picked up principally by those who attempted to exploit the later Wittgenstein's discussion of "language games". It could be argued that the language appropriate to disciplines popularly called scientific does not exhaust the linguistic possibilities. The Christian Faith has its "language game". All that can be demanded is that its usage should be plotted, its grammar exposed, its criteria of validation stated. If a coherent answer to such questions can be supplied, then the language emerges as meaningful. It has sense.

As an argument *ad hominem* this theological counter carried conviction. It was not so clear that it took theology very far. Presumably at some point "language games" must be related to each other, in so far as they purport to deal with reality. Further, if the Church is to speak to the secular world, of what use is a means of communication that by definition lacks intelligibility except within the community of faith? Can theology be really content to settle for a communal speaking with tongues?

The handwriting was on the wall. Given the breakdown in intelligibility, it seemed to many that the road from revelation to secularity was impassable, and that the only hope lay in the reversal of the movement. Theology must start from the secular world and there uncover anew the realities that demand

religious interpretation. In this way it must establish points of reference in relation to which the christian claims and symbols may again take on meaning. Advocates of Process Philosophy, drawing their ultimate inspiration from Whitehead, looked to a metaphysic which by virtue of its empirical and dynamic flavour was attuned to the modern world and by virtue of its shape and framework seemed hospitable to the biblical Faith. Others, denying the validity of any metaphysical construction, sought rather to uncover the depths of ordinary human experience, and ground the meaningfulness of religious language more directly therein. Again no generally satisfying conclusion has been reached. Again the sixties hand on the problem unsolved to the seventies.

Behind all this ferment one further factor had for generations been at work, squeezing theology into a corner. Steadily and inexorably religion was ceasing to be the cement of society. Christianity was no longer the indispensable basis of order and the necessary instrument of integration. Religious freedom became possible; and once that step was taken religion inevitably became a cultural option, and Christianity was relegated to the periphery of society.

Within the totality of the world's life it staked out its own enclaves. It occupied the area of the personal, dealing with man in his individuality, his inward existence, his internal insecurity, his spiritual possibility. It laid hold on the area of the intimate, offering man freedom in community, liberation in fellowship, security in family life, room to be human. It marked out and appropriated the last strongholds of stability to which men could return from the burgeoning, de-personalising, identity-destroying structures of society to preserve their essential humanity.

As Christianity thus retreated, it carried God with it. In the major areas of life. He became dispensable. Either he was located at the limits of human thought and human need where man could not yet cope or not yet understand, or He was confined to those sacred areas of individuality and domesticity that the Faith now claimed for its own. He inhabited the supernatural or haunted the human heart. Either way He was peripheral and socially irrelevant.

In this light, the struggles of theology with the question of history and the question of meaning receive fresh illumination. The persistent refusal to take history seriously becomes comprehensible from a new angle. The flight to some special kind of sacred history is one manifestation of the relegation of God to a supernatural world. The attempt to interpret a historical revelation exclusively in terms of man's self-understanding is an indication of the relegation of God to a personal and intimate sphere. Similarly with the problem of meaning. Christianity played its own special "language game" in the strange different world of God. Alternatively it sought the roots of intelligibility in the depths of existential experience where the landscape bristled with I-Thou encounters.

Yet Christianity could not indefinitely remain content with so restricted a role. How was it to recapture social relevance?

How was it to relate itself to the contemporary world? It could not speak the Faith with confidence and power because the great christian symbols had lost their potency and were no longer intelligible to the secular society. Perhaps then it could apply the Faith, and speak relevantly to the great moral issues of the day.

The difficulty was that a private ethic was all that it possessed. The weapons required were not to hand. What fitted the family did not necessarily fit the State. The relatively clear demands of the face-to-face relationship were one thing. The imperatives appropriate to the clash of structures, communities, and nations might well be another. The intractable problems of the modern world seemed unlikely to be solved by individual ethical action. Political decisions were required. Therefore political guidance must be given and political pronouncements made. What was demanded was a theology of social action.

This tool theology was not able to provide. How was the gigantic leap to be made from the perspectives of the Gospel to the details of political decision and the specifics of social action? Some interposed the general principles of the moral law. Others inserted "middle axioms". Others erected the concept of "the responsible society". None of these counters adequately carried the traffic or sustained the tensions of the crossing.

Increasingly it was concluded that the Church could not rest content with the innocuous resolutions with which governments were annually bombarded. Clear christian directives must be given. Specific christian judgments must be made. Panels of experts must be gathered, to study the problems, arrive at christian verdicts, gather the implicit assent of the communities they represented, and urge their solutions on the secular authorities. In the sixties, the process gathered momentum. In the international field, the climax was the Geneva Conference where in fourteen days it was apparently found possible to reach christian judgments on a substantial number of the most intractable issues of the modern world. In the national setting, the decade closed with the Sign-In on World Poverty, where the transition from the Gospel to detailed political prescriptions was accomplished with an apparently effortless ease. At both these tables it seemed that theology was the absent guest. It remains for the seventies to issue her an invitation. There seems little guarantee that she will initially prove to be an articulate speaker.

If the total diagnosis is in any sense accurate, then the magnitude of the challenge faced by theology becomes clear. The Christian Faith today stands outside the world, desperately striving to ground itself in the stuff of history, to come to birth in the categories of meaning, and to run its revolutionary way through the social travail of the times. Once theology sat enthroned in the seats of power. Now she is the intruder, if not the outcast, fumbling at the gate for her credentials, marked down as incredible, meaningless, or irrelevant.

It is tempting to retire into embattled ecclesiastical fortresses, stop the ears against the creaking of the foundations, carry on the internal conversation in the language that befits the Lord's People, and settle for an ethic expressive of a God who has become a shadow in the interstices of human relationships. For that, however, it is already too late. Doubt has not halted at the Church walls. A sense of ethical irrelevancy increasingly invades the christian consciousness. Most serious of all, even within the circle of Faith the language is steadily ceasing to communicate.

That is why it is futile to write off secular indifference as simply the result of wilful disobedience to the evident Truth. To be a modern man, christian or no, is to share the contemporary consciousness, and to know in the bones that faith is desperately difficult. The christian theologian in the seventies will need to listen with agonised intentness to the scripture, to the tradition, and to the secular world. Nor is the Minister exempt from this travail. For every time he mounts his pulpit and every time he attempts the discharge of his pastoral responsibility, he enters the heart of the theological storm, accepts the burden of his modernity, and seeks within this world the emergence, in speech and action, in language and in living, of the strange new world of God.

NEVILLE CLARK

THE CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL SCENE-I

The first of two articles.

The great theological giants of this century have now passed or are now passing from the scene—Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Paul Tillich, Rudolf Bultmann, Karl Heim, the brothers Niebuhr, and the brothers Baillie. We face a more democratic scene where men with less charisma vie for a face in the theological sun. No great and authentic voice thunders from Germany or Switzerland. As with politics, so with theology, we find ourselves in the age of common men. This may be good for us, and yet many of us look back with nostalgia to days when a new book from one of the great theologians struck deep into our souls and stabbed us wide awake. I can still remember the days when, as a young minister in Bath, Barth, Brunner, and Heim stirred me to new theological understanding, or in the forties when Tillich began to open up new vistas for me and when Bultmann challenged the complacency of my theological jargon.

Yet let us not despise this day of lesser men, for out of the theological mixing pot of our days new insights are emerging and new emphases are being made. Moltmann, Pannenberg and Sauter; Pittenger, Daniel Day Williams, John Cobb and Richard Overman; van Leeuwen, Gregor Smith and Harvey Cox; John Macquarrie, Gordon Kaufman and Langdon Gilkey—all these men in divers ways are

creating new approaches and fresh concerns. To these must be added the voices of Catholic theologians, so long outside our ecumenical circles—Karl Rahner, Hans Küng, Johannes Metz, Edward Schillebeeckx, and, strangely late and posthumously, Teilhard de Chardin. No! the voices are there, although it is sometimes difficult to find our way in the theological 'babel.' J. A. T. Robinson, in his *Honest to God* and other writings, has at least raised the questions, even if his somewhat muddled thought has not given authentic answers.

In two articles I cannot hope to offer more than a summary approach. I shall attempt to trace the forces at work in our current scene—theological and cultural, then look at some of the theological questions that are raised for us. In a second article I want to look at some of the creative emphases which are emerging.

I. THE CULTURAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

In the past three decades the West has been moving through a cultural transition, already anticipated in the last century. We are learning to speak of the post-Christian era. It really began with the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, the Age of Reason in which the emphasis fell upon the increasing success of natural science. The forces which shaped it may be seen in the last century, and today the Christian Church faces a secularized world. The word 'secular' has become a significant part of the Christian vocabulary, and our major problem is how to communicate with a world which has fixed its sights upon the realm of sense experience and has little time for those available realities upon which religious faith is primarily grounded.

The past three centuries have seen the triumphant advance of the sciences to the point where they have given man a mastery over his natural environment, over his physiological and psychological structures, and over his sociological matrix, which has defied all expectations. Whereas three centuries ago the cure of disease and the end of famine and the alleviation of mental illness were, in the last resort, matters of prayer and religious concern, now man has achieved a success which was not very evident when it was left to God alone. In the decade ahead still more extraordinary success in the scientific realm may well face us—the synthesis of the DNA molecule, the basis of life, and the production of a living cell; the ability to alter the coding of the DNA molecule in the human embryonic stage so as to remove prenatal birth defects; the capacity to preselect the sex and even the I.Q. of babies; the control of the human ageing processes; the development of brainwashing techniques which can rob men of their freedom; and so on. All this tends to create an atmosphere in which men turn to science as the universal provider, where once they turned to God, and in which there is an increasing preoccupation with the world of sense experience so that spiritual issues drop into the background of life. When we add to this the technological dimensions of scientific discovery, we find ourselves still more in a world where material values have

been enthroned. Face to face with an affluent society, where 'things' have become all important, modern man regards all our talk about God as so much nonsense. Secularization has taken over and men question whether what Christian men talk about really makes sense.

We need to note, at once, that science arose in soil fertilized by the Christian world-view. The sciences have two dimensions—an inductive and deductive. Scientific method consists of varying mixtures of rationalism and empiricism, of theoretical models and experimental investigation, the two intimately tied together. The roots of the rational, logico-mathematical aspect of science lie back in Greek thought, but those of the empirical, experimental and inductive aspect of science must be sought in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. The Hebrew mind was aware of the mystery of God and under no delusions about the creatureliness of man. If man was to understand the ways and the wisdom of the Creator, it would be only as he humbly investigated the world itself and sought the pattern of the divine ways in the world around him. His human reason was yet creaturely wisdom. He could not regard it as the supreme and immortal aspect of man, something which humans shared with the gods and which made them immortal. The Greeks might do this and hence take more interest in the rational contents and ideas of the human mind than in the particulars and sensible data of the world around them. But the Hebrew saw man's will as the central reality of human nature and held that the way of obedience was the way of knowledge. God would be known only as He chose to make himself known in his world and in human history, and man would know only as in humility and obedience he sought to walk by what was disclosed to him. So the empirical inductive approach to nature was fundamentally a heritage of the Judaeo-Christian understanding of God and his world.

It is significant, too, that science did not arise in areas, such as India, where the religious springs of the cultures were of the world-denying variety. If the world is not real and man's salvation consists in escaping from it, why try to understand and control it? It was Christian missions, followed by Western economic imperialism, which took science to these lands. For the Christian faith is a world-affirming faith. Immediately we come to the issue of secularity! If science has given birth to secularity, to a this-worldly concern, this too should not be decried. The creation story pictures God as declaring the freshly created world, with all its potential for development, as good. The Hebrew saw God working out his purpose on the stage of human history. The Christian found the focal point of his faith in the reality of the Incarnation, of the Word becoming flesh in Jesus of Nazareth. Christian salvation was not an escape from this world but an entrance into the life of God's Kingdom here and now, a living of God's will in the midst of this world. Our Lord by his healing miracles, by his concern for the poor, the outcast, and the racially underprivileged indicated a concern with man's physical

HWF IS MISSION

The co-operation of every minister is sought in presenting the challenge of HWF.

This is vital if we are to maintain the evangelistic thrust of our Baptist Denomination.

1970 Target £167,000

**The Home Work Fund
4 Southampton Row
London, WC1**

well-being and his social and economic setting. Forgiveness of sins had for Jesus a relation to the whole man, and new life with God meant a new system of relationships in this world. Hence there is nothing wrong with science or secularity, from the Christian point of view, provided they are properly directed for God's glory.

Man is called to subdue nature and cooperate with God in finishing God's world. So he has the divine gift of scientific knowledge and technological skill. Man is called to fulfil God's purpose in this order. Hence a this-worldly concern is not wrong if it be under subjection to God's purpose and activated always by the Christian hope.

As the secular society spreads around us, however, influences become manifest which do not recognise the transcendent presence and have little concern for any over-arching purpose. The Age of the Enlightenment with its rationalism marks the dividing point between an outwardly Christian culture and a culture dominated by science and secularity. Comte saw this in the last century when he divided history into three successive eras—the religious and theological; the metaphysical and speculative; the scientific and positivistic. For him religion with its myth-making and metaphysics with its abstract rational speculation were asking questions with which man was no longer concerned. Issues concerning God and creation, the first cause, the final cause, eschatology were no longer viable. Science had taken over, with its concern with what was empirically observable and what could be experimentally verified. Positivism must mean the end of religion and of metaphysics, a preoccupation with what was susceptible to scientific investigation and what could be predicted by scientific methods. It is significant that, ere his death, Comte sought to start a new religion, in which the worship of humanity, with a priestly hierarchy of scientists and a liturgy based on that of the Catholic Church, gave an outlet to man's essential religiosity. Comte, however, was the prophet of secularism; his positivism and his attack on religion lie behind much of our current secularism. His thought is echoed in some of the ideas of Barth, Bonhoeffer, and the advocates of secular Christianity.

The contemporary attack on religion is much more evidently influenced by Feuerbach, Marx and Freud. Each, in his own way, dismissed God as a fiction created in human experience and projected upon the backdrop of the universe by human imagination. Feuerbach saw God as a projection of man's ideal self and reduced theology to anthropology, Marx regarded religion as the opiate encouraged by the 'haves' among the 'have nots,' so as to direct the concern of the latter to 'pies in the sky when they die' rather than to 'pies here.' He reduced the movement of history from the level of providential overruling to that of economic determinism. Freud saw God as man's projection of an 'ideal father image' upon the world-screen and regarded religion as a neurosis arising in those whose human father image had disappointed their expectations. To these we must add Nietzsche with his atheistic existentialism, his cult of the superman who determined

his own triumphant existence, and his scornful rejection of the Christian philosophy of love. His influence appears in our own time in the 'God-is-dead' theologians whose early demise we are now celebrating.

Let us remember that the reality of God and the sense of a transcendent presence are called in question by many today. Positivism finds expression in those who, at the linguistic level, call in question any religious and theological statements, since they will accept as 'sense' only those statements that can be empirically verified. Naturalism is a natural accompaniment of the this-worldly concern which science and secularity have brought into the centre of our lives.

Yet other forces were also at work in the last century, seeking to deal in a positive way with the issues which scientific progress and growing secularization were raising for religious man. Their influence still persists, and the leading thinkers are being re-studied. Hegel with his emphasis on the Historical, Schleiermacher and religion as feelingful experience, Ritschl with his concern for the Kingdom of God, Troeltsch and his historical relativism—each in his own way asked questions which we are still asking. How is history related to the divine life? What is the nature of religion? How is the Christian faith related to other faiths? What has the Christian revelation to do with human society?

In the first decades of this century the towering figure of Barth put a quietus on man's religious questioning. God has spoken and man must submit himself to the divine Word. Attempts to come to terms with and to speak to the secular world were, only too often, stopped. The famous debate between Barth and Brunner is a reminder that the search for some point of contact between faith and man's cultural environment had not totally ceased. Barth called for the abolition of religion and for the absolute exclusiveness of the revelation in Christ, but Brunner still sought for some disclosure of God elsewhere, however negative it might be. Barth's distinctive contribution lay in two emphases. He emphasised the place of revelation and the divine activity of disclosure in his concern with the Word, and he made his theology Christo-centric so that all his theological thought is focalised in the historical incarnation, the Word made flesh.

Hindsight may well show that theologians like Tillich helped to hold open the bridge without which the man of faith would not have been able to speak to his world or to hold dialogue with other religious faiths. Bultmann, aware that a language barrier existed, undertook a process of radical demythologization, which left him little but a Christ event that possessed existential import and in relation to which men might achieve authentic existence. Yet he did see that man must communicate with the contemporary cultural situation and its scientific condition, even though his understanding of science was related to the last century rather than this. Furthermore, his process of demythologization reduced theology to anthropology, while his thought concentrated upon

individual existence and ignored the social dimension of man's life. Finally, his demythologization failed to differentiate between historical actuality and the mythical and symbolic structures with which the significant events of revelation were inextricably bound up. For example he treated the resurrection as myth and ignored its dimension of historical actuality which Moltmann and Pannenberg are now emphasizing.

As we have just suggested, Tillich provided some continuity, although even his theology has been superseded by more potent rivals in the contemporary scene. Yet there are many significant insights in his theological approach despite its weak points. His understanding of revelation, his development of the significance of symbol in man's understanding of God, his emphasis on the reality and validity of the religious consciousness as defined by man's ultimate concern, his recognition that Christian theologizing must take place in relation to the history of religions, and above all, his method of correlation in which he sought to bring philosophy and theology together on the boundary of man's questioning and God's answering disclosure—all these need to be listened to. He did seek to relate his theologizing to contemporary culture and to speak to secular man. We do not propose to examine his thought further, but rather to indicate that Barth's *Church Dogmatics* needs to be balanced by Tillich's *Systematic Theology*, if we would appraise the present situation aright. The dividing line is set by Bonhoeffer who first raised the issues which have preoccupied theological thought increasingly in the last two decades.

II. THE ISSUES RAISED BY A SCIENTIFICALLY ORIENTATED SECULAR CULTURE

In many ways Bonhoeffer has been turned into a cultic figure and often he has been misunderstood. His fragmentary and undeveloped ideas contained in his letters and papers from the concentration camp have often been taken out of the context of his whole theological development. Despite his attack on Barth, a great deal of Barth's theological emphasis remained in his thinking. He misunderstood Tillich and might well have changed his judgment had he lived to peruse this thinker's *Systematic Theology* and later writings. His rejection of religion and advocacy of religionless Christianity must be understood in the light of his *Cost of Discipleship* and his own practice of the divine presence in the days of his imprisonment, his 'secret discipline.' He was fundamentally Christocentric, like Barth, and his published lectures on Christology remind us of how central this doctrine was in his thinking—*Christ the Centre*. What he has done is to make us very aware of the problems we face in living in a secular society and communicating the Gospel to secular man.

He rejected the description of Christianity as a religion and called for a 'religionless Christianity.' We need to realize that what he rejected as religion was either an individualistic piety with an other-worldly slant or a dogmatic and metaphysical

structure which imprisoned the Christian revelation in a strait-jacket. Here he was a true disciple of Karl Barth but one very concerned to communicate his faith to a world which found little room for the 'piousness' or the authoritative dogmatism that he rejected. Hence he attacked those who seek to set limits to scientific knowledge by filling the gaps in such knowledge with God. We are increasingly aware, as science has progressed, how dangerous to our faith this habit has been. Again, he attacked the philosophy that places God in the limit-situations of life, its crises. Rather he called for a God who is present in the midst of life and who comes to men in the midst of their this-worldly concerns. Yet, once more, he was aware of the problems set by scientific achievement. Its concentration upon this world order and its increasing mastery of it, at human and social levels as well as those in the preview of the natural sciences, meant that the thought of any other or supernatural order and the understanding of divine transcendence were brought into serious questioning. In many enigmatic utterances, he therefore calls for a fresh understanding of divine transcendence, for speaking in a secular way about God, for relating our faith to this world order and not opting for the other worldly, for promulgating a 'religionless Christianity.'

Increasingly, as Bonhoeffer has been read, and often misunderstood, he has set the pace for our post-Barthian and post-Bultmannian theological concerns. For now, as Bonhoeffer was saying, we are living in a secular and science dominated age, and it is to this age that we must speak. At once the problem is posed of the nature of theological language. How can we validate such language to an empirically orientated society, which demands the same kind of verification as that required of scientific language? How can we justify our language about God, about the transcendent presence? If we have our own 'language game,' what does it signify? Immediately the problem is raised about the nature of transcendence and our theological 'models' for God. Again, have the biblical models and images any unique authority and validity? In an age which rejects all authority except experience and in the light of over a century of the historico-critical approach to biblical studies, we can no longer cling to ideas of the inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture. All theologians who matter have now settled this issue, and a new understanding of the Bible as the word of God is generally accepted. More than ever we are being thrown back through the Church and the Bible to the Christ to whom both point and of whom both testify. In an empiricist age, the understanding of transcendence, religious authority and revelation centres in the issue of Christology.

Once more we face a set of problems. How are we to relate revelation to what the historian understands by history? Again, when nature too has become historical, both with the acceptance of its evolutionary past and with the increasing reshaping of nature by the historical progress of science and technology, 'becoming' becomes more significant. How are we to envisage God in the light of this? What does the model

'personal' mean when applied to God, for personal being is dynamic? What does history with all such ramifications mean in the life of God?

Yet other issues arise at the social level and in the area of other religions. What does salvation mean and what are its implications for man's social, political and economic life? Can the Church any longer concentrate upon saving 'souls' for another worldly destiny, and ignore the crying issues of racial injustice, social oppression and economic poverty? If so, ought not eschatology to have social, historical and cosmic dimensions? Is it not a Biblical vision that the whole universe is to be redeemed?

Now in any attempt to produce a contemporary theology, some viable philosophy must be found in the contemporary scene. There have been times when an age was characterized by one or two dominant philosophical systems. Today, however, we live in a pluralistic society, and this is evidenced in the variety of speculative thinking. Naturalistic and positivistic thinking have found their most significant expression in linguistic analysis and the thought especially of the later Wittgenstein and philosophers like John Wisdom, Alastair McIntyre, Antony Flew, and Braithwaite. A theological response to this underlies the incisive thinking of I. T. Ramsey. The strands of naturalistic thinking already referred to underlie the secular and radical theologians. Existentialist thought is still potent though somewhat superseded because of its inability to have a social or cosmic reference. Kierkegaard's influence has reached into the background. Buber still has some measure of importance. It is Heidegger's wedding of existentialism and phenomenology that has come to the fore. His attempt to analyze phenomenologically the nature of human existence and his later thought with its understanding of not-being as the veil of being lie behind, not only Bultmann and Tillich, but now the thought of John Macquarrie. Evolutionary philosophies have found theological expression in Teilhard de Chardin and his followers. The metaphysical system of A. N. Whitehead, the philosophy of organism, with its acceptance of an organic model for the universe, its emphasis on process and its picture of a developing God as the fellow traveller with the world, underlies a strong strand of American theologizing. Process theologians like Daniel Day Williams, Richard Overman, John B. Cobb, Jr. and Norman Pittenger employ it. Finally, the Marxist-humanism, with its emphasis on the future, its secular eschatology, and its search for transcendence has influenced theologians like Moltmann, Pannenberg, Sauter, Johannes Metz, Edward Schillebeeckx, Karl Rahner, and Carl Braaten. Here the seed thinker on the philosophical side is Ernst Bloch, whose works are being translated from the German (*Man on His Own*; soon to be published, *The Principle of Hope*.) In my second article we shall turn our attention to the theologizing mentioned in this paragraph.

ERIC RUST

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

The publication of the N.E.B. Old Testament may truly be deemed a glorious achievement of team work. Basically there were two teams at work on the Old Testament, the Old Testament panel itself and the literary panel, but the latter, to expedite and simplify procedure, at one point detailed a sub-panel to do the donkey-work on some of the more technical books. This setting up of a sub-committee is probably half the secret of the excellence (generally conceded, I think) of the book of Job. Denominational differences never came into consideration except by way of jokes and leg-pulling. (It may be food for thought within our denomination, that there were four Baptists on the Old Testament panel and none on the New Testament panel.) Each panel worked as a team, but they did not work in splendid isolation, there was much coming and going between the panels, and the literary panels never met without a member of the Old Testament panel there to tell them what it really meant! And there was team spirit between the teams too, and often enough the Old Testament panel would send drafts back to the literary panel to be improved upon!

Behind the scenes all the time was the machinery of the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses who provided a full time secretary and in the last stages also provided two editors to prepare the final typescript for printing.

Throughout the whole process it was team work of a very high order. That is not to say that individuals did not play their part as such, and do a lot of work in their own studies behind the scenes. Each book was introduced to the panel in the form of a draft translation made by one of the members or by a non-member specially invited, and he was always present when the panel went through it—a humbling process if ever there was one! Much checking and co-ordination had to be done, especially where Chronicles borrowed materials from Samuel and Kings: this was a task that was not made easier by the Chronicler's trick of not quoting always verbatim (or was this due to copying mistakes by subsequent scribes?). Finally, quite a number of individuals read the whole thing through in proof four times, that is to say, the Library edition in first proof and then in revise, and the standard edition also in first proof and revise.

The actual work of translation and of settling the final form of the text, however, was the work of the panel in session, which partly accounts for the long time it took to complete, but on the other hand brought us to the near-accuracy that we all hoped to achieve. We were searching for the meaning of the text, leaving the literary panel to search for the right English words, and we left no stone unturned in the search. Sometimes after a gruelling morning or afternoon session we would arrive at a form of words which would 'do' if need be but which all felt was not really what the Hebrew was getting

at. Often when this happened, some one next day would re-open the whole discussion with some new angle of approach which had come to him overnight, and then as like as not we would arrive at something that would command assent. If it didn't the dissenting version would go as an alternative in the footnote. This was not always just an overnight process; occasionally after several months we would be recalled to look at this or that passage and have second thoughts on what we had done. There were times when, after hours of discussion, often animated, with strong expression of opinion and many questions and counter-questions, someone would see the real meaning and force of a passage: when this happened we all felt that no one sitting alone, unstimulated by discussion, would have got there.

The panel did not lightly discard traditional renderings. A careful study of the alternative meanings given in the footnotes will reveal a number that are clearly retained because the text has always been interpreted that way, and although the panel thought differently the traditional interpretation could not be ruled out. On the other hand some traditional renderings, like the 'skin of the teeth', which were impossible were completely discarded.

Those of the panel who were preachers as well as Hebrew scholars often unconsciously acted as safeguards against the loss of too many of the familiar sermon 'hooks', but the comment 'another good sermon gone' was not infrequently heard!

What sort of literary aids did we call in, above and beyond the Hebrew text? Dictionaries of cognate Semitic languages were probably the most important—Accadian, Arabic, Syriac and Aramaic. In this field words have often been shown to bear other meanings than that traditionally assigned. Take, for example, *nephesh*, whose meaning of throat or neck, as well as self and that undefinable thing called 'soul' (a meaning that goes contrary to all Hebrew psychology) is no new discovery, but is only now finding its way into general use. *Nephesh* is given more than one meaning in N.E.B. according to the demand of the context. Here are some examples:

Neck: 'Save me, O God;

for the waters have risen up to my neck.' Ps. 69.1.

'lockets' (lit. neck-boxes) Isa. 3.20.

Throat: 'Therefore Sheol gapes with straining throat,' Isa. 5.14.

'Before they tear at my throat like a lion' Ps. 7.2.

(*Self*) 'Let me die . . .' Judg. 16.30.

'We have escaped like a bird

from the fowler's trap' Ps. 124.7.

Soul: 'to walk faithfully in my sight with all their heart and with all their soul.' 1 Kgs. 2.4.

Life: 'Did he not take his life in his hands . . .' 1 Sam. 19.5.

Another example of the use of lexicons is that of the very common Hebrew verb '*asah* 'to do'. This verb has been found also to mean 'turn' (with an undotted *ayin* in Arabic) see Ruth 2.19 and 1 Sam. 14.32, and also 'cover' (with a dotted *ayin*) see Gen. 6.14; Job 15.27. Covering can also mean protecting

a sin Ezek. 17.17. (To remind you: the existence of two *ayins* in Hebrew can be seen by the Greek transliteration of two well-known names both beginning with *ayin*, namely, Eli, and Gomorrah.)

Yet another two-meaning word is *kephir* which means a young lion (Judg. 14.15) but can also mean an unbeliever (Arab. *kaffir*) as in Ps. 34.10 where young lions would be anything but a suitable parallel to 'those who seek the LORD'.

It is common knowledge that the pronunciation of the Hebrew text as standardised by the Massoretes in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. does not necessarily represent the pronunciation at the time it was written. Many a verse or word gains new meaning when pronounced differently. Judges 15.16 now reads; 'With the jaw-bone of an ass I have flayed them like asses'. There is a double clue to the pronunciation that lies behind this translation, one is the Septuagint which translates an infinitive absolute construction and the other is the natural sense of the passage. If Samson picks up the jaw-bone of an ass, it stands to reason that he is either going to 'jaw-bone' them in some way with it, or to 'ass' them in some way, and it is the latter that is indicated by the Hebrew consonants.

Mention of Septuagint brings me to that version, and in my example of dependence on it for N.E.B. it can be claimed that the preacher now comes off better than he did before. Only those who pride themselves on having a good sermon on the angel of the presence will come off worse! As normally translated Isa. 63.9 runs: 'In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them', but this makes the best of a bad job and reads a pronoun instead of a negative. The Septuagint, with the change in pronunciation of one word, simply an *i* for an *a*, and with different division of phrases, offers, as in the N.E.B. text: (starting towards the end of v. 8) ' . . . and he became their deliverer in all their troubles. It was no envoy, no angel, but he himself that delivered them; . . .' So now, instead of God's hiding himself in his affliction and sending an angel to do his work he is true to the nature of himself that is revealed in the Old Testament and he comes himself to the rescue.

Now to go back a step. It is well-known that scholars welcomed the Dead Sea Scrolls (once the dust of controversy over their date had settled) as the earliest records we have of the form of Hebrew text, and it will surprise no one therefore who has the library edition of N.E.B. to read 'so Scroll' in several footnotes in Habakkuk and Isaiah and occasionally elsewhere, notably Deut. 32.8,43. The simplest example of its use in N.E.B. is Isa. 21.8 where the Scroll, reading *haro'eh* for '*aryeh*' corrects a scribal error, so that instead of 'a lion' we get 'the look-out' who 'cried out: All day long I stand on the Lord's watch-tower'.

As may well be imagined, the Psalms gave the translators many a problem. What to do with the headings? They are known to be later additions, and their form differs in the ancient versions. Their musical directions and terms, if indeed such they be, are completely unknown to modern musicians;

guesses can be made, but are they worth the candle? There were, indeed, so many difficulties about the headings, that it was decided to omit them. The lack of continuity of theme is another problem: the meaning of any individual psalm is sometimes obscure and there is no context to help. In the early stages of Psalm translation the situation was such that there was a very real danger of choosing the theme of the Hebrew Psalm and then writing an English sacred poem on that theme. This is admittedly a caricature, but I think the point will be taken. Again, what to do with metrical form? Strictly speaking there is no rigid metrical form in Hebrew, although the balance of thought and the phenomenon that goes by the omnibus name of parallelism imposes a certain amount of rhythmic regularity on the Hebrew text. What was done was to match the length of the English line, where feasible, to that of the Hebrew. Not the least problem with the psalms was their utter familiarity in the Coverdale or the King James version to so many English churchgoers. To dare to change Psalm 23 would seem to be an act of sacrilege. To make Psalm 110 meaningful with its succession of crisp images and staccato phrases couched in so few terms as to be almost unintelligible at so far removed from the time of their origin and with its inherited overtones of messianic aspirations very nearly requires a creative genius. At the other extreme, what is one to do with the humdrum monotony of Psalm 119? Knox managed to keep the alphabetic structure, but the N.E.B. translators decided that this is too artificial a procedure to reap any profit thereby.

Translation is not without its interesting moments. One such occurred as long ago as 1956. Until the 10th of February in that year, the Old Testament panel had used 'assembly' for *qahal* and 'company' for *edah*, but on that day we found ourselves using 'company' for Korah's *edah* and it was felt immediately that we needed a different word for one or the other. 'Company' was every bit right for Korah & Co., but what to do for the community as a whole?—and there in the word 'community' was the very word for the job.

Psalm 128.3 speaks about a wife in the innermost recesses of the house. Innermost recesses will do well enough in prose but not so well in poetry. In searching for a word we thought of 'boudoir' but immediately dismissed it when we found that it was defined by derivation in the dictionary as the sulking room. That wouldn't do at all, so now she is to be found 'in the heart of your house'.

Job 30.4 reads 'they plucked saltwood and wormwood and root of broom for their food'. This gave lots of concern because of the unlikelihood of broom, a plant mostly used for brushwood, being eaten. One morning two of us received a postcard which simply read, 'Don't eat any broom until you have seen me'. The reason being that the writer had discovered (not by eating) that the root of broom is nauseous and poisonous in quantity, and that possibly what was meant was a parasitic growth on broom, hence the footnote in the library edition (*probably fungus on broom root*).

How far does one run the risk of 'de-easternizing' the Old Testament as one puts it into modern English. 'Sandals' or 'shoes' was a simple case of this risk. On the whole it was felt that 'sandals' should be used where reasonable (Exod. 3.5), but 'shoes' where English idiom firmly calls for it, as in Ps. 60.8 where God flings his shoes at Edom.

There were times when our discussions rose to a very high pitch of intensity and application such as to make one feel that 'inspired' would not be too strong a word. After such sessions the panel felt that it would have been good to have had a tape recording. There is, however, no such record, nor yet a shorthand recording of any of the discussions that were held. They remain as treasured memories of those who were privileged to be members of the team.

L. H. BROCKINGTON

YOUTH IN FURTHER EDUCATION

Students are like dahlias: they come in all shapes and colours, but they are a recognisable and definable breed. Statistically, they are being fruitful and multiplying all over the world; and not only they, but also the institutions at which they are registered.

Further education was described in the Act of 1944 as "full-time and part-time education for persons over compulsory school age". It provides for such a wide variety of possibilities, from organised cultural training to professional diplomas, that I propose to comment on one area of it alone—that which is called higher education in the Robbins report. This, being interpreted, is work at universities, colleges of education and advanced (i.e. post—"A" level) courses in other colleges.

The present pattern of higher education is a multi-magnetic field. Diversity has been the order of recent years. There is the autonomous sector of the universities; and there is the public sector comprising colleges of education, polytechnics, colleges of technology, technical and further education colleges and art colleges. In the last ten years the number of students at universities in Britain has more than doubled, yet in the same period they accounted for a decreasing percentage of the total number engaged in higher education: in 1962, for example, it was 60%; in 1967 it was down to 54%.

So we may justifiably speak of an explosion in the student population. We are, however, in the company of other nations, some of whom are making louder bangs than we. Canada has doubled the number of its students in six years. Japan now has over a million students, who represent 32% of its people. (Britain's come to about 15%.) In the U.S.A. they make up 34%, though in the state of California they are already topping 40%.

Such figures help us to draw the graph of our expectations to a suitable scale. It is everywhere realised that the better training of the intelligent is a good investment. But the dividend may not be to everyone's liking. This is apparent as we begin to enjoy the first instalments of the pay-off. Some would

say we are enduring rather than enjoying them! In my judgement, they are mistaken. The day when we no longer have an educated elite in our society along with the relatively uneducated masses is almost upon us. The educational process is reaching out further and further into the homes of the people. The proportion of students whose parents are in manual occupations has risen and will continue to rise. The Town is increasingly donning the Gown. And this development is good.

Like other factors that may be discerned in contemporary society, it poses questions about the form of our Christian witness. What has happened in fact is that most denominations have sprouted chaplaincies, for which function there were already precedents in the armed forces and the hospitals. The nature of this ministry has been governed partly by the finances available, partly by the beliefs held about Gospel and Church, and partly by a groping pragmatism. For instance, every synod in the Methodist Church appoints ministers to be "responsible for the oversight of Methodist students." Likewise, there are Roman Catholic chaplains in most universities with the aim that "the Bishop, as a successor of the Apostles, may be brought into contact through the structures of the visible Church with the students who are his pastoral care". On the other hand, the policy of the Church of England (which now has at least one full-time chaplain in every university) is that its chaplains should be pastors to the whole community, so that they should *not* give priority to gathering Anglican students into a coherent body.

Baptists, too, have been party to this general movement. At first their activity was understood almost entirely within the denominational framework. Along with others, our chaplains have learned the scope of the job as they have made the attempt to do it, and at this stage the documented record of their thinking makes an interesting study. I think there is broad agreement among them at the present time that we have done right to be present in this manner in the institutions of higher education, that we can only spell out the name of Jesus Christ there in partnership with other Christians, and that we are still learners.

A suitable fixed point of reference from which to begin is the Hyde report of 1959. Its background may be sketched in as follows. Student-organised Christian groups began in the 1870's, and denominational groups were established about the turn of the century, the first Baptist ones being at Cambridge (in 1902) and Oxford (in 1905). The Baptist Students Federation was founded in 1947 out of the desire of individual Baptist student groups to meet together nationally. It was the first such denominational structure. Baptist chaplains were officially designated after the formation of B.S.F., though before that time there were not a few already at work unofficially. The Hyde report, which was initially called for the committee of B.S.F., thus summed up a decade. It was entitled *The Pastoral Care of Baptist Students*.

The report drew attention to a number of matters, including the expansion of higher education, the newly formed Christian

THE BAPTIST INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED

4 Southampton Row, London, WC1B 4AB

To the Members of the Baptist Ministers' Fraternal.

Dear Friends,

"Mirrors were dim as with the breath of years".

Dombey and Son: Charles Dickens

Charles Dickens died on 9th June 1870 at the age of 58 — he was born in the year of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow.

This year the centenary of Dickens' death is being remarked in many ways but in particular by a book by Angus Wilson entitled "The World of Charles Dickens" of which I am fortunate to have an autographed copy. Put this book on your library list for it is beautifully printed, bound and illustrated. The merit of its content is assured by the intimate knowledge the author has of his subject — he is vice-president of The Dickens Fellowship.

The other evening Angus Wilson in the course of a T.V. lecture read extracts from various works rather as a gourmet describing delectable dishes and these included the quotation at the head of this letter. The neglected home of Mr. Dombey is described by Dickens in graphic detail — indeed in minute detail for he had extraordinary gifts of observation.

Among my friends, especially my younger friends, I find a reluctance to read Dickens. So complete is the absence of interest that it seems he too is "dim with the breath of years". I am a little saddened to find sometimes all that is known is from some T.V. serial as if the books were books of the films!

But Dickens does not suffer alone. Have you asked to see the insurance policies of your church?

Some treasurers cheerfully admit that the last treasurer three-times removed could not find the policies. Others will produce from a corner of the church safe or strongbox some documents bound with the red-tape of the day before yesterday — many such policies were cancelled years ago.

Insurance arrangements "dim with the breath of years" are far from reflecting the values of today. Even yesterday's figures are out of date.

Consult us and make a clean sweep.

Yours sincerely,

C. J. L. COLVIN,
General Manager

PS — Above all read Dickens again this year! I am tremendously in debt to Charles Dickens and am quite unashamed of this plug.

Association at Nottingham, and the needs of technical colleges. It also suggested we should look for full-time chaplains. Despite such remarks, however, the prominent feature in the denomination's attitude was reflected in the title of the report: the question we wanted answering was how we could continue to give pastoral care to Baptist young people who had left home for higher education.

Was this, however, the best way to frame the question? As it is still often asked in this way, it becomes important for the members of our churches to eavesdrop on the continuing conversation among chaplains. That the question should be asked—and answered—is right: that it should be asked by those with an informed group of the structures of life is integral to its rightness. I would argue for some form of chaplaincy in the institutions of higher education on the ground that there should be someone with theological insight who can *listen* to those already at work in them—as teachers and administrators as well as students—and who may try to interpret to the whole Church what is happening there. Two or three years ago I heard a distinguished Vice-Chancellor giving an acute perspective analysis of some issues to be considered in a university today. In the course of it he said this: "A good many people think that the first and essential function of the Chaplaincies is pastoral, i.e. concerned with the care of the individual." (Note the definition of "pastoral". There we see ourselves as others see us.) But he went on: "I would not dispute that work of that kind is essential, but I cannot really be concerned about the care of individuals without being concerned about the nature of the community in which they live, and the strains and stresses within it."

That dual concern, with neither element overplayed at the expense of the other, is the way our chaplains have come to understand their pastoral role. The next noteworthy stage to which reference can be made was their first conference, which took place in 1960. It was called a *Conference of Chaplains to B.S.F. Societies*. The nomenclature was factually correct. Chaplains, after all, were appointed by a tri-partite agreement between the B.S.F., the local society and the Baptist Union; and nearly all of them held pastoral charge of a central church in a university city. What time they could give to student affairs had to be squeezed out of a calendar busy enough already. Yet at that conference they dared to raise the question whether they could share in the responsibility for the whole academic community and not just for a small section of it labelled Baptist. A memo was sent to the B.U. on this subject.

The question was destined to assume increasing significance. There is no doubt it grew out of the experience of team-work with chaplains of other denominations. Within two years another conference was convened. (During the interval a Secretary for Student Work had been appointed in Baptist Church House.) This one was called a *Conference of Baptist Chaplains to Students*, the field of work was getting bigger! But we were not in it alone. As an endorsement of the partnership of the denominations an Inter-Church conference

was soon to be held. Nor would it be a once-and-for-all gesture.

It is the way our chaplains have come to understand their role. But not they alone: 23 of them recently sent in replies to a questionnaire, and 15 of them reported that they had been recognised by the academic authorities. It is therefore not surprising that the most recent Baptist conference, held in September 1969, was for *Baptist Chaplains in Higher Education*.

In March 1968 the B.U. Council approved the appointment of a group to examine matters relating to student chaplaincy. Its eventual report was accepted by the Council in November 1969, including its recommendations that there be a Standing Committee of the Union associated with the Secretary for Student Work. So another decade has been summed up. But the growing points for the next ten years are more numerous than ever.

In Britain we are a small denomination with limited resources. We do not claim to hold a monopoly of the Gospel, so we shall not be ashamed to learn from others, and sometimes to receive from them too. But without arrogance we may also claim we have a contribution to make for the cause of Christ. This article began with statistics. There is room at the end, I hope, for one more, even if it is muffled in a generalisation. It is my opinion that whatever other pressures make their demands on the Home Work Fund we ought somehow to release a greater proportion of it for ministry in the area of higher education. I would add the area of industry too; but that is another story.

MAURICE WILLIAMS

CHRISTIANITY AND MEDICAL ETHICS

"To die or not to die?"

Within living memory, how things have changed. Most of us remember the picture of the bewhiskered, frock-coated, benevolent doctor at the bedside of the sick child. He exhibited great confidence, and that was about all he had to offer. How different today! The doctor has a great armamentarium of very potent medicines and a backing of the most elaborate diagnostic apparatus. The expectation of life has about doubled in the last 100 years and today the commonest complaint is senescence.

For many, death is postponed but has life been extended? For some, the process of dying has been made longer but possibly more difficult.

In another article which recently appeared in this journal, Dr. Michael Ramsey discussed the shortcomings of a humanist doctrine to explain the modern dilemma of man. The humanist ethic is also inadequate and only appears to work because it assumes a Christian way of life. The humanists are working on

borrowed capital and the "ought" of their ethics will have little effectiveness on the next generation of "post-Christian civilisation" as it has been called.

No-one denies that there are different codes of ethics and that some are better than others. The humanist is certainly better than the cannibal. The modern tendency, however, is to make all codes equally valid and to replace the moral law by the dicta of scientific experts of all kinds. The well-known scientist is able to get off with all sorts of patently inaccurate diagnoses of the moral state of affairs and ineffective cures, because he is a so-called 'expert'. His scientific training and knowledge does not rescue him when it comes to his own personal conduct. He is just as selfish as the next man and often far more proud.

Conduct can be influenced by selfish desires and also by the pressures and taboos of society. The Christian should look basically to the Bible for guidance.

1. *The Creation accounts* in Genesis make clear:

- (i) The value of human life—because it is made in God's image.
- (ii) Man is given dominion over every living thing—not only plants and animals but ourselves also.

2. *The Mosaic codes* obviously have relevance:

"You shall not kill" has a clear import for us, but also Exodus 21:22 outlines the code to follow in cases of mis-carriage which are not accidental. If no harm comes to the woman—then there is a fine, but if harm comes to the woman—life for life, etc. It indicates the value placed on the unborn child as well as on the mother.

3. *The New Testament Writings* record the words of our Lord as well as of the apostles and Dr. Luke, of course.

Matthew 19 deals with the husband and the wife, single folk and children. Jesus taught men to love God first and then to love their neighbours, i.e. those who are in need. If we all truly loved, there would be no necessity for laws. Laws are needed to check the unloving, we hope without restricting the loving too much.

What are these laws?

1. Many people, Christian and non-Christian, are prepared to say that there is a built-in moral law which guides men. Even those who will not recognise it for themselves, expect others to respect it.

2. Sometimes the Christian is chided for attempting to make Christian laws apply to non-Christians. "Let us make our own mistakes" they say, forgetting that no-one lives in a vacuum and others will almost certainly be affected by their mistakes.

3. Lastly, we live in a democracy. Thank God for it. The Christian minority has every right to be heard and to influence legislation in the interests of all.

Fundamental to all our thinking on this subject is the Biblical doctrine of man.

"Seed for Sowing and Bread to Eat"

(Isaiah 55:11. N.E.B.)

The Annual Report of the Baptist Missionary Society with the above title has been sent to your missionary secretary, together with new B.M.S. leaflets.

Further copies of the Report can be obtained, price 2/- each, and supplies of the leaflets are available for free distribution.

The Society appreciates your advocacy of its work and will be grateful if you continue to mention its opportunities and needs in your prayers and your preaching.

Please encourage your missionary secretary to obtain and use effectively the free literature which is available.

Inquiries will be welcomed and information supplied by the General Home Secretary:

**REV. A. S. CLEMENT,
BAPTIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
93 GLOUCESTER PLACE,
LONDON, W1H 4AA**

God created man in his own image. God is Spirit and so man has spirit too. Whether the spirit is put into him at conception, or at birth when he becomes independent of his mother, can be debated. Because man is spirit, death is not the end of man and part of his personality goes on living after physical death. What is more, God is a communicating God—unlike Baal and so many other of the so-called gods. Man too can communicate and by speech which is a human characteristic.

In summary: My dog at home is body with mind, a man is body with mind plus spirit, but the born-again man—the Christian—is body with mind plus spirit plus the Holy Spirit of God.

God the Holy Spirit is part of the Christian. When the Christian's conscience warns him of a doubtful action, contemplated or performed, the Holy Spirit gives him the power to choose and to do what is right in God's sight. Only then can he have a conscience which is without offence to God and man. Moreover, the Bible makes it very clear that man of himself finds it very difficult to choose and to do the right things because each of us has a built-in bias to do wrong—the "original sin" of the theologians—the "ordinary nature" which we all know as ourselves. The Biblical view is the foundation for all our belief and conduct.

So much for the basic principles in outline. What of some practical applications.

I. A most interesting, and worrying, biological phenomenon is the population explosion, the present increase in the birth-rate and in the number of people reaching adolescence. Some of the problem, of course, is due to the fact that after World War II, the Governments put money into medical effort and not into agriculture. It is all very well saying "if we farmed better, we could feed them all", but the hard fact is that we just cannot get enough food into the right mouths. Let us not forget that about a quarter of the grain crop of India is eaten by rats and other vermin which the Hindus will not exterminate. They got rid of the mosquito and malaria, but not the rat.

There are frequent Scriptural injunctions about responsible parenthood and there is certainly no commandment against planned and spaced children. Nowhere is it implied that the sex act is *only* for procreation of children. Husband and wife are told to be "one flesh". Here the Roman church's interpretation and ruling differs from that of the Protestant church. That is why I have tried to outline Biblical principles and not ecclesiastical interpretations and dictates. Methods of family planning which prevent fertilisation cannot be said to kill human life.

II. However, what about abortion? In the Mosaic codes, abortion was punishable if brought about deliberately. But we also saw that man was given dominion over every living thing, and this includes the babe in the womb. As Lord Fisher of Lambeth has pointed out, only when the babe is separated from its mother is it at all capable of an independent life; only then does it become a person with full rights. Protestant

doctors are usually prepared to put the mother's life before that of the unborn babe. They would say that for them to stand by and do nothing to help the mother would be wrong. Doctors are legally protected when, on medical grounds, they advise and procure an abortion. The mother's health is something which they are capable of judging. Some of our Roman colleagues, however, would not take this action. We all know that medical states can be influenced by social conditions, such as the size of the family, the size of the house, etc. The oft-repeated pregnancy and blood as thin as water are good medical reasons. But the New Act brings social reasons in as a primary cause. Of course, if a student becomes pregnant, it is inconvenient and may cause some mental distress, but for many doctors this is not a valid reason for abortion. For the young person who has had repeated abortions, as many have had in Eastern European countries, there is a very real risk of a prematurely born babe when eventually a baby is desired. Even a simple operation has its risk and complications, even death of the woman.

III. There are problems of treatment and research. Man has been given the Universe to enjoy and to subjugate. The world at the beginning was said to be good, but never perfect; man is not perfect either. So in an imperfect world, disease and ageing have to be grappled with and all efforts made to overcome them. Our Lord's healing miracles make it quite clear that it is not the will of God that we stand by and just watch. The doctor's first concern must be for the welfare of his patient as an individual. Today there are dangers of depersonalising medicine. The patient, a number, gets lost amongst a large team of doctors and technicians of all sorts. It is the Christian doctor's duty to keep contact with the patient. Christian nurses obviously have an even bigger part to play here in befriending and encouraging the bewildered one.

A very real difficulty concerns the treatment of patients with advanced degenerative disease such as cancer. So often, in their weakness, pneumonia develops. What does the doctor do? Give antibiotics which will cure the pneumonia? If the patient is capable of further useful life, yes, give the antibiotics but if it is just going to prolong the act of dying then probably withhold the drug.

"You shall not kill, but should not strive
Officiously to keep alive".

Research must go on and some is directly related to medical treatment. The efficacy of drugs and the methods of testing them can raise some problems. As long as the welfare of the individual patient is put as a prior responsibility, above the research, all will be well. A very fatalistic or materialistic doctor may have different ideas, however, and put his research first.

Some research is into fundamental biological processes. Growth, senescence, reproduction, all have a bearing on the problems of cancer. Most, if not all, of the big steps forward in medicine have been made with animals in the laboratory. We think of insulin in the treatment of diabetes as a very

obvious example. The heart/lung machine was devised as a research tool to circulate and aerate the blood in an animal preparation. This machine is now standard equipment in most big hospitals where heart operations are performed and, of course, it can be used in the intensive care units where people, who have had heart attacks or are terribly shocked, are treated. The benefits received from basic research are very great and the work should be encouraged, not stifled. But again we have to be sensitive to hear the alarm bells of conscience.

IV. What about transplants? For years we have had blood transfusions which are obviously life saving to those in need. "The life is in the blood" as Leviticus says. Why so many of the splinter groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses deny blood transfusion to patients when their own unborn children get their very life from the mother's blood is a puzzle. Grafts of the window part of the eye have given sight to countless men and women with scars and opacities of the window. Kidney transplants now save many lives and prolong usefulness. The eye can be removed at death, or as the result of an accident to the eye before death. Most of us have two kidneys and could get by with only one. But what about the single organs, the liver and the heart? If a heart is taken, the person would be dead. There are legal problems concerning consent and responsibility, and medical problems concerning the definition of death. The time of death can have very obvious legal repercussions. The dilemma is that to be of much use the organ (kidney or heart) must be technically living, but it should only come out of a dead person. What principles guide the doctors?

- (i) The doctor's prime duty is to his patient, to get him well again. The doctor must do nothing which will expedite the patient's dissolution, even though he is a potential donor
- (ii) The doctors in charge must be convinced that the patient is incapable of recovery to an independent existence. Sometimes there is very obvious brain damage and life is only kept going by the machine. This is a common occurrence these days and at some time the machine has to be switched off.
- (iii) The doctors in charge of the potential donors *must not* be those in charge of the recipient.

The Christian has a duty to both recipient and donor so he will walk always circumspectly and with love.

V. The last problem I want to mention concerns Voluntary Euthanasia. The person concerned will have to sign a document at least thirty days previously, giving him time to change his mind! This has been called "suicide by proxy", or self-murder with the help of another. It is an obvious breach of the sixth commandment "You shall not kill". Recently there has been a great deal written on this topic. I want to deal first with three misconceptions:

- (i) Relief of pain is now possible with drugs (other than morphia) which do not depress respirations so that the

patient dies. The giving of these pain killers is *not* euthanasia.

- (ii) The patient on a heart/lung machine who is totally dependent on the machine, cannot be said to be very 'alive' though not technically 'dead'. If damage is so great that it is decided to stop the machine, then that is not euthanasia either. It is to leave to natural processes the outcome of a situation where medical intervention can no longer help.
- (iii) Few doctors are so arrogant as to think themselves infallible. Attempts to estimate the chances of life are not easy and wide margins must be left. Nature has still many secrets to reveal and she often surprises us with the unexpected reversal of some process. Spontaneous regression of disease does occur.

The Voluntary Euthanasia Bill, however, would make it possible for the doctor, nurse or attendant to set about the *deliberate dissolution of an adult innocent of any criminal action worthy of death*. This is a new principle in the United Kingdom; I cannot see many doctors applying for the post of local authority executioner! In passing, it seems odd that the anti-hanging lobby seems to be largely made up of the same people who want the Voluntary Euthanasia Bill to be passed.

What is the answer? The Christian doctor must do his best to relieve all suffering and to give the patient a purpose for living (such as helping others) even in the last few days of life. In places like St. Christopher's Hospice in South London, the folk can live peacefully and die with dignity. The Christian Church throughout history has led with hospitals and infirmaries. The Christians must see that the State gets its priorities right and that money is made available for research, treatment and shelter for terminal illness.

Round the doorway into the library at the S.N. Medical College at Agra, under the shadow of the Taj Mahal, were three marble plaques; on the left, the Hindu code, on the right, the great Hippocratic code and across the top, the British. Each was in English. The Hippocratic code had statements about loyalty to colleagues, keeping professional secrets and, of course, taking care of your teachers and seeing that they are not in need! The long Hindu code had a portion removed the black marble letters had been picked out but the grooves remained. It was political dynamite, absolving all doctors from the necessity of treating those who were unable to pay fees. The British statement was very simple, "Do, as you would be done to". This golden rule was paraphrased by Lord Lister, the father of modern surgery: "The one rule of practice is you put yourself in the patient's place". He was a great Christian and was much respected.

As a doctor, I have a duty to the patient, but as a Christian I have also a duty to God and will be answerable to Him for my conduct here.

"To die or not to die" is still often a difficult question but

WEST HAM CENTRAL MISSION

409 Barking Road, Plaistow, London. E13 8AL

My dear Brother Minister,

ORCHARD HOUSE EXTENSION FUND: The builders have made reasonably good progress on the extension to Orchard House and we have every hope that it will be finished by the time you read these notes.

I am delighted to tell you that we have had a splendid response to the Extension Fund Appeal, and at the time of writing we have received over £11,500 out of the total of £12,000 for which we asked. This amount includes the Home Office grant of £6,000.

It is a great encouragement to me and my colleagues here at West Ham, that we are backed by the affectionate and generous interest of so many people in our churches, and we thank everybody who has made this result possible.

ASSISTANT WARDEN AT ORCHARD HOUSE: We had a very heartening response to our advertisement inviting applications for the post of Assistant Warden at Orchard House, and the calibre of the people applying was very high. We have appointed Mr. R. F. Whitwell of Stanground, Peterborough, and he will be taking up this appointment with us on September 1st next. We shall value the prayers of you and your people for him and his wife as they start this very important piece of service.

OUR COLOURED FILMSTRIP: Our coloured filmstrip has received a tremendous welcome from people in many organisations in our churches, and I would like to commend it to you as one way of getting across to your people the kind of work the Mission is doing in the name of the whole denomination. We are anxious for the filmstrip to be used to the utmost capacity and we invite applications from Sunday Schools, Women's Meetings, Young People's Fellowships, and any other groups. If you run a Church night, this filmstrip makes a very good evening.

We make no charge for the filmstrip but we put it on record that we have never yet refused a donation or a collection! Please ask whoever writes to me about the filmstrip to give me alternative dates if possible.

With warmest good wishes for God's blessing on you and your own ministry.

Yours very sincerely,

STANLEY TURL.

Superintendent of West Ham Central Mission.

I hope I have helped you to see something of the modern "doctor's dilemma" and how a Christian can find some answers.

J. T. AITKEN.

Edmunds, J. V. & C. G. Scorer (1968) *Ethical Responsibility in Medicine*, E. & S. Livingstone, Edinburgh.

Fisher, Lord of Lambeth (1967) Lord Fisher and the Abortion Reform Bill. *In the service of medicine*. No. 49 p. 1. C. M. F. London.

Saunders, C. M. F. (1960) The Case of the Dying. *Nursing Times* and other articles.

Vere, D. W. (1970) Euthanasia and the right to Death. *In the service of Medicine*. No. 61, p. 23. C.M.F. London.

Further information may be found in the publications of the Christian Medical Fellowship and its journal 'In the service of medicine'.

JEW AND ARAB IN THE HOLY LAND

The crucial problem in the middle east is Jew-Arab co-existence. It is one thing to look on the situation from afar and form an opinion; it is quite another to spend a while among those concerned with the problem, discover their reactions and note the facts in the situation. Even a short visit makes nonsense of much that is poured out by the popular press; several visits, enabling comparison of one time with another, are valuable.

Looking at the Jewish position first, three facts emerge: first, their desire for peace. The customary greeting in Israel is "Shalom", peace, a greeting which is taken seriously. On a recent visit President Zalman Shazav welcomed our party with an address on 'Shalom' because, he said, what more can anyone wish? This desire for peace finds expression in Israel's relations with her Arab citizens, for example, in the freedom which is given to all Arabs within her territory. The bridges over Jordan are open, anyone can pass either way; no oath of loyalty is demanded; there are no armed guards (with the understandable exception of the temple area); local law prevails in the occupied areas and teaching continues as before the occupation. As one staff officer remarked, "We know what life in a ghetto means. We don't want to turn the areas under our control into a ghetto." General Dayan has repeatedly declared "No matter what happens, we shall keep the bridges open". It is worthy of note that there is almost no migration from the West Bank, though any may emigrate at any time; on the other hand a large number of persons move every month from Eastern Jordan into the West Bank, settling there of their own free will. Many concessions are made; income tax, always heavier in Israel than in Jordan, is allowed to remain at the Jordanian rate (Jerusalem excepted), law courts are staffed by Arab lawyers; school is free until the

age of twelve (Israel has always limited this until the child is eight). These concessions are costly to Israel, but they express Israel's desire to live in peace with her Arab people. The Hebrew University is open to all, Jew and Arab alike; it is customary for education authorities to see that every Arab works side by side with Jews so that there shall be no suggestion of segregation. More and more Arabs are attending university; grants are available to them as to others.

It is a pity that Israel's attitude is so often misrepresented; the idea that the Mosaic "eye for an eye" is Israel's policy is just not true. No Arab terrorist is ever sentenced to death although many Israeli civilians sometimes die in the terrorist attacks. Few severe punishments are imposed. Of those tried for terrorist activities from April 1968 to April 1969 only 97 received higher than 10 years, 622 received prison terms from 4 to 10 years, 3,500 were fined and 150 were acquitted. There is no desire to "break the spirit of the Arabs"; where Israeli officials overstep the mark and bring trouble on the Arabs, these officials are speedily and strongly dealt with. References are often made to the number of houses blown up in occupied areas. Since June 1967 less than 400 houses have been destroyed because their residents aided and abetted Arab terrorists. The purpose of this measure is to deter, but no house is blown up without careful checking of all circumstances and in each case authorization signed by the Minister of Defence is required. Abandoned houses in some areas have been destroyed because they presented a security risk. Israel wants good Arabs in their land and does not wish them to feel in any way oppressed; that is why they are allowed to develop their own culture and are given every opportunity of following their own religion. It also accounts for the way in which some Arabs continue to live and work in the way their forbears have done for generations. Israel offers, but does not compel, the use of modern equipment and up-to-date amenities. Concern for the welfare of Arabs is seen in Israel's recent efforts with the bedouin who have long lived their nomadic life in dirt and disease. Those in the original Israel area were given land to work and they long ago settled to this new life; but in the newly occupied territories there is a multitude of bedouin: these are being encouraged to live together in self-contained villages where modern amenities will remove the squalor, reduce ailments and provide regular schooling for the children. Such an opportunity has never before been offered the bedouin.

Second, Jews have their own internal problems. Israel today is a conglomeration of people from all over the world, coming from many different backgrounds, and representing varying social levels. There are political struggles as well as social difficulties which have to be resolved. Any new state encounters problems because it lacks tradition, but here we have a new state which is hampered in some ways by a tradition which has been moribund for centuries and is now revived as though it had always existed. There are religious problems too. These impinge on the political, but they exist in their own right also. While a large number of Jews are orthodox and near-

orthodox, there are many more who would count themselves as non-orthodox, even non-religious. Some are ultra-orthodox, living, working, dressing and acting as did their forefathers several centuries ago. Jews are not united by their religion or by their "Jewishness", they are united only in their determination to reclaim the land and build the state of Israel. It must be remembered also that there are a number of non-Jews who are Israeli citizens, for anyone can be an Israeli, but not everyone who is an Israeli can be a Jew. It is an open question as to how long Israel can go on admitting and absorbing non-Jews and yet remain a Jewish state. At the moment there are about two and a half million Jews and one and a half million Arabs.

Third, Israel has made mistakes and no one, least of all themselves, would attempt to deny or hide their blunders. While Israel is not an occupying army, while there are no armed guards, while it is the avowed policy of the government to make life easy and happy for the Arabs, errors do creep in and unjust situations do arise. These mistakes are all on the level of administration and those responsible for the errors are severely dealt with. Human nature being what it is such errors are bound to arise; it is to the credit of Israel that there are not more than there are. On the other hand, it must be remembered that Israel is trying to make life cleaner and better for Arabs, as well as Jews, so that the demolition of houses which ought to have been pulled down long ago is understandable while the removal of people and property that threaten the peace of the country, though regrettable, cannot be considered unreasonable.

The most regrettable aspect of modern Israel, at least to me, is the massive memorial erected to the memory of the six million Jews who suffered under Hitler. The great hall, the Ohel Yizker, with its ever burning flame, commemorating the various concentration camps, is impressive and stirring, but the rest of the memorial with its lurid pictures of torture is disappointing. Such visual aid is most distressing and cannot but prolong the hatred and bitterness which prevents forgiveness. There are even worse items to remind folk of the past in the old memorial on Mount Zion. The tourist does not see these memorials; they are for the eyes of Jews and especially the young generation. A great pity.

Turning to the Arab point of view, it is necessary to distinguish four kinds of Arabs: Israeli, West Bank, Jordanian, and the rest: Lebanese, Syrian, Egyptian, etc. The West Bank Arabs, together with others in Israeli territory were once known as Palestinian Arabs; they are different in outlook, culture and attitude from the rest of the Arab world. This is one of the difficulties in assessing the Arab attitude: there are so many of them, 90,000,000. First, the Israeli Arabs; more than 40,000 Arabs remained in the new Israel when the lines of demarcation were made in 1948. Most of these were in Galilee, though some were scattered over the rest of the area. Through the twenty-two years of the new state they have been gradually integrating themselves into the community; while it took many years for them to accept new ways and

Useful Baptist Pamphlets and Booklets

| | |
|---|------------|
| WHY BE BAPTISED? | 12 for 2/- |
| WHO ARE THE BAPTISTS? (W. W. Bottoms) | 9d. |
| THE OFFICE OF A DEACON (C. B. Jewson) | 9d. |
| THE WORK OF A SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER (J. Murphy) | 4d. |
| CALL TO OBEDIENCE | 1/6d. |
| MINISTRY TOMORROW | 2/- |
| SEVEN REASONS FOR BELIEVER'S BAPTISM. (F. B. Meyer) | 6d. |
| SEVEN REASONS FOR JOINING THE CHURCH (F. B. Meyer) | 6d. |
| YOUR BAPTISM (S. F. Winward) | 2/- |
| THE DEDICATION SERVICE (S. F. Winward) | 1/3d. |
| PLANNING YOUR MARRIAGE (R. W. Thomson) | 1/6d. |
| BAPTISTS AND SOME CONTEMPORARY ISSUES (D. S. Russell) | 1/6d. |
| THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES 1948-1969 (E. A. Payne) | 2/- |
| BAPTIST BULLETIN (Spring, Autumn, Winter) | 6d. |

All postage extra—4d.

from

BAPTIST PUBLICATIONS

4 Southampton Row
London, WC1B 4AB

means, they have, in most cases, benefited from the amenities offered to them. They are represented in the Knesset (Israel's parliament) and share in the life of the nation.

Arabs in the Galilee area maintain their own way of life; in other areas, however, such as Haifa, they have so integrated themselves that it is difficult to know who is Jew and who is Arab. Indicative of this co-existence is the fact that during the 1967 war, when many Arabs seceded, there was no incident in Haifa; Jews and Arabs worked side by side throughout the six days. This happened in other areas too. I was disturbed however to notice a subtle difference in the general demeanour of many Israeli Arabs, especially in Galilee, since the war. I have an uneasy feeling that if the opportunity arose a number of them would return to the Arab world, or at least be on the side of the Arabs if there were another war.

Second, the West Bank Arabs. There are more than a million of these, all of whom could be Israeli Arabs; they live in territory now administrated by the state of Israel, but are not prepared to be considered part of Israel. They have their reasons and it is necessary to understand their point of view. It is easy to applaud the kindly approaches of Israel and be puzzled by the unresponsive attitude of the West Bank Arabs. To understand their attitude certain factors should be noted. (a) *Fear*. This is so deeprooted that it cannot be eradicated in a short time. Resulting from a closely-knit community life and the constant out-pouring of propaganda, this fear is perhaps the greatest barrier to understanding. The West Bank Arab scarcely knows what to believe and, naturally, tends to accept what the Arab world says. This is not calculated to reduce his anxieties! (b) *Hatred*. Springing from memories of the 1947 war, as well as earlier incidents leading up to that event, misunderstanding is being fostered by a campaign of hate from outside the West Bank area. Arab teachers put into the minds of their scholars the idea that the Jew is to be hated; they are nurtured in ways to destroy them. (c) *Culture*. The standards and ideals of the Arab world differ enormously from those of the Jew. Arab society is patriarchal; the Jew is democratic. This patriarchal system produces suspicion and bedevils good relationships; submission to authority makes understanding with Israel virtually impossible; the head of the family, the head of the community, the head of the state—they speak, and what they say goes. To question any pronouncement would be unthinkable. (d) *Bitterness*. Hard feelings rankle in the hearts of most Arabs; they recall the swift loss of their property and businesses in 1948 and cannot forget that once they lived in what is now Israel. Christians, no less than Moslems, express this bitterness; there appears to be little to choose between them where Israel is concerned. With this is bound up the problem of refugees, quite another story, and one that needs more room than this article will allow. (e) *Propaganda*. From every side the West Bank hears derogatory things about Israel, often misrepresentations and exaggerations, but who are they to question? Perhaps this explains the astonishing situation which exists: in spite of the obvious

gains due to the occupation, many Arabs still cling to the things they hear from outside.

Third, the Jordanian Arab, living east of Jordan, is in a sorry position. Looked on with a measure of contempt by his Arab neighbours and being out of touch with the Arab world, Jordan is almost friendless. But she keeps up the appearance of unity and is encouraged by Egypt who needs Jordan because Nasser daren't leave a section of the Israeli border covered by an unfriendly state. Fourth, Lebanon has always been friendly towards Israel and does not want to be involved; infiltrations are not allowed to go too far. Syria and the rest of the Arab world are preparing for a clash.

Not one Arab with whom I have talked could offer hope of rapprochement with Israel. Old Jerusalem, until 1967 entirely Arab, now has Jews and Arabs mingling together, living together, working together; many Arabs cross daily from East Jerusalem and the West Bank into Israel, benefiting from the employment which is there obtainable, but they cross back again with no indication of better relationships. The division is great and deep. While the physical barriers have gone, psychological barriers remain. The West Bank and, to a great extent, Jordan itself, is alone, bewildered and uncertain, yet clinging to whatever the Arab world may offer.

What hope is there of a solution? There are promising factors which should be mentioned; for instance, the Holy Land is the centre of three important monotheistic faiths, all worshipping the same God, all having a right to venerate their God in this particular part of the world, all revering certain areas as sacred to their faith. It is the earnest prayer of many that Jew, Christian and Muslim might get together to seek the will of God and set an example of understanding love. Even a few from each faith could point the way. It is sad to realise that religion is as much a barrier as politics.

There are a hundred thousand Christians in Israeli territory, an influential number but not, I fear, an influential factor in the situation; most of them are Arabs, which means they are opposed to Israel. The Jews have a department, the ministry of religious affairs, which seeks to help each faith, and endeavours to draw its members towards one another. Academic and theological discussions take place, but little can be done on the most important level, the practical one of living together.

A possible way is through individual relationships, but these are few and far between. Three years is a short time, there may yet develop more contacts especially among the younger groups where interchange of thought may be possible. More promising is the younger generation's attitude. In spite of the propaganda hurled at the Arabs there are signs that younger Arabs are beginning to think for themselves, few indeed, but it is a beginning; at any rate it is a straw that Christian teachers, both Jew and Arab, are grasping.

Can war be averted? I came back from my last visit saddened in heart because earlier signs of reconciliation had disappeared. Some would blame the six-day war for this, but I am not so sure; at any rate that event was inevitable and much

has been learnt from it. Two solid facts make the dilemma: Israel has come to stay; Arabs are determined to drive Israel into the sea. Sooner or later the clash must come; unless the influences I have mentioned grow stronger, I fear it may be sooner than is desired.

ERNEST WILLMOTT.

ABOUT BOOKS

IMPORTANT CITIZENSHIP PUBLICATIONS

The Rev. Donald Black has made the suggestion that some of our readers might like to know from time to time of important publications on Christian citizenship matters. He has prepared the following list for us and we are grateful for his helpful summaries.

Many of the publications are reasonably priced and those marked with an asterisk have been purchased for the B.M.F. Library.

THE RESPONSIBLE CHURCH. Edited by Edwin Barker, S.P.C.K. 1966 price 5/6 90 pages.

In a series of articles—The Nature of Christian Social Concern; Responsibility in a Welfare State; Technology's Impact on Society; Race Relations at Home and Abroad; Rich Nations and Poor; Peace and War; and the Use or Misuse of Natural Resources are discussed. The names of the authors of the chapters are: The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, Bishop of Leicester; Nesta Roberts, Health Correspondent of the Guardian; Dr. D. G. Christopherson, Vice Chancellor and Warden of University of Durham; Philip Mason, Director of the Institute of Race Relations; James Mark at present with the Ministry of Overseas Development; Rear Admiral Sir Anthony Buzzard, retired from the Royal Navy; Hugh Montefiore is Bishop of Kingston, formerly Vicar of Great St. Mary's Cambridge and Canon Theologian of Coventry Cathedral.

A valuable book for discussion in groups.

A STUDY GUIDE ON THE RESPONSIBLE CHURCH can be obtained free from the Board for Social Responsibility of the Church of England.

* *EXPERIMENTS WITH MAN.* World Council of Churches Study No. 6. price 10/6 102 pages.

In order to obtain knowledge to be applied to human beings there is no final substitute for observing human beings. Experiments on animals and other preliminary procedures are useful and necessary, but they cannot replace the observations and assessment of the human response to new therapeutic methods. This book is a report of a consultation which brought together biologists, pharmacologists, professors in medicine and theologians. All accepted the necessity of

properly conducted experiments on human beings within limits subject to ethical safeguards. A beginning was made in the investigation of the acute ethical questions which modern bio-medical research poses to man and to the Christian. This report will be of interest not only to ministers, but also to doctors who are members of their congregation.

PUNISHMENT. Published by the Church Information Office price 3/6 52 pages.

We cannot hope to bring Christian insights to bear on the theory and practice of punishment until we are much clearer about the various issues involved. What this pamphlet attempts to do then is to first formulate some of the questions which punishment involves, and to suggest some considerations relevant to their answers. Next, to note some specifically Christian reflections on this theme, and finally to list some of the salient points which seem to arise out of the foregoing discussion.

In view of the correspondence recently in the Baptist Times and the emphasis in the political scene on Law and Order a very helpful booklet.

STERILISATION an Ethical Enquiry. Church Information Office 46 pages.

In view of the increase in world population, in some countries the Government Authorities are actively encouraging Voluntary Sterilisation. Is sterilisation simply to be an alternative to contraception or a substitute for the exercise of the will enabled by grace. What are the moral implications? Therapeutic sterilisation (to protect the patient from some specific illness) Eugenic sterilisation (to prevent the birth of offspring with possible hereditary defects) Sterilisation for personal convenience, punitive and compulsory sterilisation are all considered.

The Report can find no grounds on which to reply in terms of an absolute negative to sterilisation. A very important contribution to social responsibility thinking.

*** NEW APPROACHES TO MEN OF OTHER FAITHS.** World Council of Churches 1970 95 pages. 13/-.

The main purpose of this book by Karl F. Hallencreutz is to stimulate further discussion on issues in the relationship between Christians and men of other faiths in the world today. It seeks to identify some of the enduring issues which need further reflection and to indicate certain new directions which have to be explored in this area. Dialogue is one of the catch words of theology. What does it mean for Christian Mission? This book is an interpretation of recent mission theology.

ABORTION An Ethical Discussion. Church Information Office price 5/- 70 pages.

It is often repeated that about one hundred thousand abortions are illegally induced in England every year. What

is the Christian attitude to legalised abortion? For some mothers there is a genuine risk that their health, physical or mental may be impaired if the pregnancy goes to term. For other mothers there is a risk that their child may be born deformed. Unmarried expectant mothers sometimes resort to abortion to rid themselves of a child which may prove to be socially inconvenient. The broad conclusion of the report is that in certain circumstances, which are carefully outlined, abortion can be justified.

The Abortion Act 1967-69, a factual review is a 16 page booklet supplementing the other report and giving the background to the present legislation and statistics on abortion since April 1968. It outlines some medical, social and moral problems demanding urgent consideration. An excellent study and discussion document.

ADOPTION—THE WAY AHEAD (Obtainable from Association of Child Care Officers, Oxford House, Maple Street, London, E.2), 5/-.

From time to time most Baptist ministers are involved as referees in the matter of the adoption of a child. We have known the great happiness that this has brought into the lives of young people and because of this we might be tempted to think that this at least is one area of social concern that can be left happily on one side.

Is everything all right as far as legislation is concerned? A group of members of the Association of Child Care Officers in the Midland Region answer that question with a resounding NO. In 1967 they set up a group "to enquire into and made recommendations about changes in the Law and Practice of Adoption in England and Wales." The findings of these two years work are condensed into this report which suggests a complete reappraisal of the situation.

The report is based on the principle that what is best for the child should take precedence over all other considerations and this in itself raises several fundamental principles in connection with adoption. The suggestion is that adoption should be placed on a much more formalised basis than ever before, e.g. no adoption unless the child is placed specifically by a registered adoption agency and the mother's right to change her mind and to withdraw her consent must cease once the child has been placed.

As Lord Butler, who writes the foreword, says "there is no doubt that this report challenges existing practises and looks to the future. As such it is probably the most important study of adoption procedure and bad practice that has been produced for a long time.

DONALD D. BLACK.

RETIREMENT HOMES FOR MINISTERS, MISSIONARIES OR OTHER ELDERLY BAPTISTS

A very pleasant house with large rooms, situated only a short distance from the centre of Bovey Tracey in South Devon, has been purchased by the B.M.M. Housing Association, and converted into two excellent self-contained flats.

Applications for these flats will be welcomed from retired Baptist Ministers, Missionaries, or other elderly couples, and full information regarding the accommodation available can be obtained from the Secretary of the Local Committee which has been responsible for this project—Mr. C. P. Stentiford, of Indio Gables, Bovey Tracey.

We are grateful to Mr. Ralph C. Stow, the General Manager and Secretary of the Cheltenham and Gloucester Building Society, for his assistance in obtaining mortgage facilities, and to others who have given financial support, including donations over a period of three years from Trust Funds of the Devon and Cornwall Baptist Property Boards.

The friends at Bovey Tracey Baptist Church will very cordially welcome the new tenants of "Elmhurst", Marlborough Terrace, Bovey Tracey, and their Church Secretary, Mr. Hands is a member of the Local Committee.

The B.M.M. Housing Association after a lengthy period of negotiations and planning now begins to see a partial fulfilment of its objectives. In addition to the Bovey Tracey project, the flatlets at Manor Court, Worthing are all fully let, and primarily Planning permission has been received for the erection of an annexe in the grounds. The Chairman of the Housing Association, Sir Cyril Black, laid the foundation-stone on 21st February of a block of flats at "Poynings", Victoria Drive, Bognor, and these should be completed in the late Autumn, whilst the new flats at Oxhey, near Bushey, Herts. will probably be opened by Sir Cyril in July.

Further projects are under active consideration at Upminster Waltham Forest, Brighton, Westcliff, and other places. If there are possibilities of similar developments elsewhere, especially where suitable land is available adjoining a Baptist Church, or if you feel able to support us financially by donations, or investment in 5% Loan Stock, please write me so that we can continue our projects to provide retirement accommodation for Baptist Ministers, Missionaries, and their wives, and other elderly people in need of such accommodation, and also hostels for home and overseas students, addressing your letter to Robert Brown, Executive Vice-Chairman, B.M.M. Housing Association, at 27 Pembroke Avenue, West Worthing, Sussex.

ROBERT BROWN