

# The Word In An Audio-Visual Age: Can We Still Preach The Gospel?

SIMON VIBERT

For a long time television has beamed its happy face into most of our homes. It is the imminent arrival of more commercial television that is new to this country and that in itself is an expression of cultural changes which need careful observation by the Christian Church. We live in an age which is dominated by the visual. Here is a selection of recent indications:

1. A recent survey indicated that British children now watch television for an average of 24 hours per week.
2. At the top of the Top Ten Music Video sales for December 1990 was Madonna, which is unashamedly visually teasing.
3. A Disc Jockey commented on 'Top of the Pops': 'That's the first cartoon to make the top ten since Christmas'.
4. At a less mundane level camera coverage of the Gulf War outstripped the ability to make comment on what was seen.
5. What Marshall McLuhan called a 'Post-literary Society' reached a new height of application in what might be called a 'Post-newspaper society'. 'Live' television news coverage of the Gulf crisis meant that newspapers were out of date before they were printed.

This is a random selection of personal observations. They summarize the view of reality as seen through the camera's eye. These observations indicate that few would disagree with the assumption that 'Seeing is believing' is a hallmark of our day. My particular concern is with the ascendancy of Commercial Television. It seems to me that the Christian Church has not yet asked the right questions about the very nature of the television medium. The Broadcasting Bill (published on 6th December 1989) has in effect started moving us in the direction of faster, more competitive, television in which advertising, almost unlimited choice and speed of coverage will win the audience. Commercial television inevitably operates within the constraining economics of the success of the commercials that it screens.

Television advertising is perhaps the hallmark of our visually stimulating age. And yet, I want to ask questions concerning the priority of sight, which is a fundamental foundation of how television communicates.

Is the priority of communication through the visual a positive or a negative trend? Does the Bible have any perspective on television as a medium of communication, or are all means permissible?

This paper will be divided into two main sections, 'The Christian

priority of the World in communication' and 'A Biblical perspective on the problem of the visual'.

## **1. The Christian priority of the Word in communication**

God's commandments came in the form of 'ten words'.<sup>1</sup> The Bible is the Word of God. According to Exodus 33:7-23, 40:34ff., God's Glory is manifested when God speaks. The symbolism in the tabernacle pointed to the priority of verbal communications: Underneath the mercy seat was kept the 'ten words' which the prophet was to take out to the people. At the heart of Christian revelation is 'The Word made flesh', who (literally) tabernacled among us and 'exegeted' the Father's Glory (see John 1:14-18). The Glory of the invisible God for a time could be seen when the eternal word became flesh.

Divine communication is Word-centred.<sup>2</sup> Notice also, though, that words are also the distinguishing feature of humankind. The ability to speak—and to use language to pass on knowledge from one generation to the next—is one of the privileges of being made in the image of God (Genesis 1:27-29). Ironically, verbal communication also remains one of our greatest problems (as Genesis 11 explains)—a problem which affects relationships at every level: inter-family and internationally.

If we are to take Word-based communication as normative for the way which God has chosen to have relationships with human-kind, how can this relationship take place?

### **a. God's invisibility is not inaccessibility**

God is not actually silent or unknowable. He has not left us completely in the dark: His Word is Light; His Son is Light. His Word is Life; His Son is Life.<sup>3</sup> Though God dwells outside the domain of sight He remains accessible to mankind. God is to be known only through the means He has created. Notice how this presupposition undergirds the first two commandments (Exodus 20:1-4):

Commandment One. God's jealousy means that He will not share His rightful Sovereignty with any other. The Christians in Rome were not persecuted because they said 'Jesus is Lord', but because they worshipped Jesus to the exclusion of any other god. It is not the worship of one God which the world hates, but the exclusiveness of God's denial of other gods which arouses distrust and scorn.

Commandment Two. The issue here switches from fidelity to invisibility. The desire to make God visible in any form expresses the wish for a god of our own making. A god which we can see and which we can control. Of course the Israelites did not ever assume that their visual images (the Golden Calf for example) were anything more than symbolic. But in fact the visual images did become gods for them because the attempt was made to restrict the Glory of God to what could be seen and controlled.<sup>4</sup> Sincere desires to construct images and icons incited idolatry rather than true

worship of God. God is to be known through the means He has made available: the Word is the way He has revealed Himself. The Word is the way He is to be found. Though God is present in every part of creation, He can only be approached through the means He has made.

Both the errors spoken of in these two commandments have much to say to us today. The first deals with the horror of following another god; the second deals with the danger of falsely representing the True God and hence making another god.

I believe that television promotes indulgence in both these errors: the one in its setting itself up as a rival throne to the true God—demanding passive submission of our intellect, will and body; the other in encouraging veneration, trust and adoration of the images of delight we see in ritual repetition day after day.

### **b. The desire for visible certainty is one of the marks of idolatry**

Perhaps Romans 1:18-32 will help us to get a little closer towards understanding the problem of idolatry.

Man suppressed the Truth about God, even though a look at the world around gives a revelation of His existence. Man became 'futile' in his thinking . . . and as a result reaped futility in every area of his life (vv. 24, 26, 28; cf. Psalm 139). Futility results in idolatry because the fallen mind fails to think correctly about God. This explains why the images that man makes of parts of the creation cannot remain neutral—as mere objects of veneration or human achievement. Because man is vain in his imagination the image he makes goes beyond mere symbolism. As Paul indicates here in this passage—we fail to understand creation as well as failing to understand the creator.

God has set eternity in our hearts and so made us creatures of worship (Ecclesiastes 3:11). Hence to satisfy our innate need to worship we end up worshipping something God has made, rather than God Himself. Idolatry in the Old Testament is tellingly spoken of as being 'vanity, emptiness' precisely because it is fruitless and dissatisfying (Jeremiah 10:15; 51:18).

So, futile thinking is inevitably manifested in idolatry. Moreover, the worship of 'vanities' in turn brings about frustration and emptiness. Idols, though powerful for evil, are 'no-gods'. We can see this illustrated in Deuteronomy 32:21 which records God's anger against the worshipping of 'vanities', which in turn will reap a vain way of life (v. 23ff.).

The word 'futility' (*hebel*) in the Old Testament can refer to the folly of worshipping 'vanities' [idols]. It can also refer to the meaningless and incomprehensibility of life (as in Ecclesiastes). It was this assumption which inspired Augustine to sum up the human complaint: 'Our hearts are restless till they find their rest in you'.

This seems to be the point of Romans 1. *Futility* in (Our foolish disobedience of God's Word inevitably leading to idolatry) reaps *Futility*

out (a meaningless and frustrated way of life).<sup>5</sup> It is as if God in effect says: 'If you want to think of me like that [that is, futile], then you will have to live with the implications of having a god like that.' God's judgment (1:18) was to allow man to wallow in the folly of his decision.

So, then, what exactly is it that has provoked God's anger (Romans 1:18)? Jacques Ellul says of v. 23:

That glory has been changed into image. Glory is what shows God for what he is as God. This glory is invisible and can only be grasped approximately by the word. This glory is the reflection of God himself and can never be transformed into a thing. God's glory is a manifestation of the truth. It is the presence of a person.<sup>6</sup>

In making these visual images of man and other parts of the creation—and worshipping them instead of their maker—we see the evidence of vain thinking, and the foolishness of trying to make visible the invisible God. To bring Omniscient God—He who is all-knowing, all-seeing, all-wise—into the realm of the seen and controllable indeed is futile.

Notice then these two effects of man's futile thought:

1. He gives glory to things which God has made rather than to God Himself;
2. He worships mortal, man-made images rather than immortal God. Creation is no longer understood as the means of revealing God. Rather creation is worshipped as God.<sup>7</sup>

## **A bad exchange rate**

An understanding of this passage in Romans will be crucial in applying the Bible's interpretation of the world to our television culture. Paul begins his in-depth teaching on the Gospel with a great negative statement. He made himself very unpopular with the Greek and Roman culture around him because he assumed that the images used in pagan worship were indeed idols. Gentiles would have assumed that Paul was simplistic in his understanding of veneration and imagery. But passages like Exodus 20 and Romans 1 would be sufficient justification to appreciate why Paul could argue that even venerating man-made visual images reveals the idolatrous tendencies in fallen man.

It takes little investigation to come to the conclusion that television has become a 'religious experience of worship' using whatever definitions of these words you wish. I think that the Scriptural reasoning behind this conclusion goes something like this.

If we do not think of God as we ought then we will be unable to worship God as we ought. A terrible exchange has already taken place: God's Glory is transferred to man-made images. Such is foolish trading still taking place in the world in which fallen man lives. Man worships that which his foolish thinking alights and rests on.

The problem of idolatry can be summarized as two-fold:  
The Idol focuses man on the Image (*eikon*) not the Word (the visual not the

verbal); the Idol focuses on the mortal (time) rather than the immortal (eternity).

To put it another way: the first problem focuses *on* the creation rather than on the creator. The second looks for strength and help *in* the creation rather than in the creator.

My main concern with television relates to the first aspect of idolatry—that the visual emphasis which is intrinsic to the very media is in fact idolatrous. The very lenses through which we look at the world are short-sighted. However, these two aspects of idolatry (visibility and mortality) may be distinguished, but not separated. Later we shall look briefly at some further implications of the visual challenge which television presents to the power of the world.

The priority of the word and the problem of idolatry as set out in the Scriptures orientate in our appreciation of how fallen man will behave in any age. The rôle of sight generally, in the Scriptures, will enable us to make our application to the present a little more specific.

## **2. A Biblical perspective on the problem of the visual**

### **a. Now centred-ness**

Neil Postman dubbed television news the 'Now . . . This' world of reporting.<sup>8</sup> The problem with the moving image is that the news is as good as instant. The camera can be on the scene filming 'live' when world events occur. There is a sense in which sight is so much more instant than sound. Not only does sound travel much slower in physical terms, but the process of reasoning which is involved in stringing together coherent sentences is slower, and gives the time needed for detailed thought and analysis.

Connected with this instant nature of the news is the problem of *context*. Television pictures exist in a vacuum divorced from any logical or historical context. It is assumed that seeing what is happening now is indeed all that is needed.

How do these observations resonate with the problem of sight in the Scriptures?

### **Sight then . . . Word now**

References made to Sight and Faith in the New Testament indicate that sight (of God, and of true reality) is yet in the future (See Hebrews 11:1-3) although a glimpse of the future was seen in the past—in the incarnation.<sup>9</sup> So, when Romans 10:7 speaks of the process of coming to faith the logical deduction is that the ground of faith is the Word, not sight. What about that glimpse of the future which was given in the past?

When we think about seeing and believing, the obvious book to turn to is the Gospel of John. In the person of Jesus Christ Sight and Word are

joined. For that reason seeing Jesus can be trusted, although of course, it is seeing of a very different kind. Let us take a step back from the Gospel and look at it as a whole.

'No one has ever seen God . . . ' (1:18).

' . . . We testify to what we have seen . . . ' (3:11).

'Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever rejects the Son will not see life . . . ' (3:36).

'You have seen me and still you do not believe' (6:36).

'No one has seen the Father except he who is from God' (6:46).

' . . . So I went and washed, and then I could see . . . ' (9:11).

'When He looks at me He sees the Father' (12:45).

'Anyone who has seen me, has seen the Father' (14:9).

'Because you have seen me you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed.' (20:29).

John's Gospel helps us to appreciate the relationship between what is seen and what we believe. None of the Gospels tells us what Jesus looks like—and we are not to try to see Him that way. But we do see through the sight that He gives!

This is the heart of the Christian understanding of revelation. As John says: No one has ever seen God . . . . But a lot of people saw Jesus.

The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth. (1:14)

Jesus is the unveiling of God. The invitation of those first converts was 'Come and see' (1:46b). But actually of course it is the fact the *God* sees us that is significant (1:48b).

Yet the privilege of seeing Jesus goes beyond seeing a God appearing as a man in flesh and blood. John is concerned with seeing what is *beyond* sight. He would have understood our phrase 'Do you see this?' as relating to understanding and comprehension. This theme is interwoven throughout the book. The problem in our Western rationalistic society is that we have very little comprehension of a reality that exists beyond sight. We are stuck in a mind-set where *appearance* is all that matters. And so it is with this in mind that I want to look at three of the characters in the Gospel who come to recognize that there is more to Jesus than meets the eye.

## **The man born blind: John 9**

It does seem that Jesus uses this incident to show that spiritual blindness is as incurable without the Saviour's touch as the man's hopeless physical condition from birth.

Yes, this man was born blind, and never knew what it was like to see (v. 11). Yet Jesus uses him as an example of the universal problem of Spiritual blindness: 'Do you believe in the Son of Man?' he asks him (v. 35) . . . 'You have now seen him; in fact he is the one speaking to you' (v. 37). We can detect a certain irony in Jesus' remark! 'Now you have

seen me (physically): you can come to see me (spiritually).'

This point is well-illustrated from the beginning of the Gospel. After the first sign is performed—the turning of water into wine—John records: 'Jesus thus revealed His glory and the disciples put their faith in Him.' (John 2:11b).

Many people saw the sign [physical sight]. But there is no indication that anyone other than the disciples put their faith in Jesus. The disciples saw Jesus' Glory and put their faith in Him.

For John, faith concerns seeing what is beyond sight. The Pharisees are 'blind' because they claimed they could see, but remained in their guilt (v. 41). Indeed, we never really leave this theme alone in John's Gospel:

For this reason they could not believe, because, as Isaiah says elsewhere: 'He has blinded their eyes and deadened their hearts, so they can neither see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, nor turn—and I would heal them.' Isaiah said this because he saw Jesus' Glory and spoke about it. (12:39-41).

### **Philip: John 14:5-14**

'Lord show us the Father and that will be enough for us' (v. 8). 'If only I could see God without having to believe what is not seen, that would settle it all.' Philip would have been very at home in our day!

Jesus responds by saying that seeing *Him* is as much of the Father as one needs to see. Yes, seeing was believing for those first Apostles. God was revealed in flesh and blood before their very eyes. But, even then Philip can misunderstand this and receive a gentle rebuke from Jesus. Seeing involves perception and submission which comes from a God-given disposition to believe what is seen.

### **Thomas: John 20:24-31**

It is only when we look at Thomas' request for visible proof of Jesus' resurrection that John finally explains how we—who may not see Jesus walking and talking with us—may believe in a God yet unseen.

Leaving aside for a moment the Prologue—where the mission of the Son is introduced (John 1:1-17)—and the Epilogue—where the work of the Church is initiated (John 21:1-25)—we have a Gospel which begins by saying: 'No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only who is at the Father's side, has made Him known.' (1:18). And ends with Jesus' words to Thomas: 'Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe.'(20:29).

We are those who have 'not seen', and we are the ones who are reliant upon all that has been written down for our belief (2:30f.) For us, faith is not related to physical sight.

For Thomas, the issue was quite different. He gets a lot of bad press from Christian preachers. But put yourself in his shoes for a moment.

First, Thomas knew that Jesus was dead! He had not been with the other

Churchman

disciples when Jesus had appeared resurrected. He was a fairly reasonable chap! No doubt his reasoning would have been approved by our logical syllogizing!

Premise one: Jesus died and was buried.

Premise two: dead men stay dead!

Conclusion: Jesus has not risen from the dead.

This doubt was only removed when He saw the risen Jesus and handled a live body. Seeing Jesus fully removed his doubt. Thomas makes one of the clearest professions of faith in the Gospel: 'My Lord and my God.' (20:28).

So the Gospel of John comes to a dramatic conclusion: No one has ever seen God, but many saw Jesus. Thomas moved from doubt to faith when he saw the risen Jesus. For him it was not so much 'Seeing is believing', but 'Believing is seeing!' As they believed, so they saw. For us? We believe because we read and hear. The Apostles had a remarkable privilege: to be true eyewitnesses to the events of Jesus—they heard, saw, looked at and touched the Word of Life (cf. 1 John 1:1–4). Our faith is based upon the testimony of reliable witnesses. But even for those Apostles to 'see' (*orao*) it meant something like 'to be admitted as a witness' (3:36). But to see God (*horao* and *theo*) means to know God. Notice these telling words in 3 John 11:

Dear friend, do not imitate what is evil but what is good. Anyone who does what is good is from God. Anyone who does what is evil has not SEEN God. (*ouk heorake ton Theon*)

And so 'Seeing and Believing' is used as a formula for coming to true faith (John 1:46, 48ff. 20:8, 29). This means coming to see beyond what is physically before the eyes, what is beyond human perception, to what is unveiled through faith.

Jacques Ellul<sup>10</sup> summarizes this marvellously:

The Incarnation is the only moment in world history when truth rejoins reality [appearance], when it completely penetrates reality [appearances] and changes it at its root. The Incarnation is the point where reality [appearances] ceases being a diversion from truth and where truth ceases being the fatal judgment on reality. At this moment the Word can be seen. Sight can be believed (because in the incarnation, but there only, sight is related to truth). The image, which normally does not have the force of truth, becomes true when the image is Jesus Christ, who is the image of the living God. For this reason John emphasizes sight—because here reality [appearance] is penetrated by truth.<sup>11</sup>

The late Malcolm Muggeridge had some perceptive things to say about the television assumption following his conversion to Christianity. Television detracts us from believing any reality that is unseen.

. . . The media have created, and belong to, a world of fantasy, the more



dangerous because it purports to be and is largely taken as being, the real world. Christ, on the other hand, proclaimed a new dimension of reality, so that Christendom, based on this reality, could emerge from the fantasy of the decomposing Roman civilisation. . . . Thus the effect of the media at all levels is to draw people away from reality, which means away from Christ and into fantasy.<sup>12</sup>

The fantasy world of sight described by Muggeridge is one where the ability to see is the only yardstick by which we assess whether something is believable or true. A world where NOW is all that matters.

### **b. Covetousness**

Another neglected commandment is the tenth. The 'lust of the eyes' as John puts it (1 John 2:16), is fed by our television advertising. Perhaps one of the reasons why this topic is rarely mentioned is just because the seduction is so subtle. Desire can be enticed through visual suggestion which goes below the threshold of normal reasoning.

The problem with subliminal advertising was that it was discovered that the desire for a product can be incited without conscious reasoning taking place. Of course subliminal advertising is in fact illegal—however the guidelines laid down by the Broadcasting Act are suitably intangible:

It shall be the duty of the Authority to satisfy themselves that the programmes broadcast by the Authority do not include, whether in an advertisement or otherwise, any technical device which, by using images of a very brief duration or by any other means, exploits the possibility of conveying a message to or otherwise influencing the minds of, members of an audience without their being aware or fully aware of what has been done.<sup>13</sup>

Whilst it is true that subliminal advertising of the nature which went on in the 1950s' experiments is illegal, nevertheless, *similar* techniques are still used with great effect. What the advertiser calls the 'Responsive Chord' is the trigger which acts when you search for products as you push your trolley around a supermarket. The image implant of a logo or brand name which was so carefully portrayed in the advertisement returns to affect unconsciously your decision-making. Of course advertising has been used as long as mankind has bought and sold. The issue with television advertising concerns the influence of showing visual effects themselves unrelated to the words spoken about a product. So the problem with advertising extends further than just the persuasion through desire for the product. It is that, though the truth may be told (albeit highly selectively), the *effect* which is visually shown in the advertisement has no relation to the product. No product could produce the visual promises that are made in some advertisements:

Former agency head, Jack Tinker, once estimated that over a billion dollars had been spent advertising each of these six objectives: new, white, cool,

power, refreshing, relief.<sup>14</sup>

And all that from one bar of soap?!

The 'delight to the eye' which drips from the tempter's taunt, encourages us to take, eat, and indulge in the insatiable appetite for more and more. Their eyes of lust are never satisfied, and the advertisers' hope is that we will never want to turn our heads.

### **c. The end not the means**

The Sacraments have been described as God's visible words. Eating and Drinking (symbolized in the Lord's Supper) and Washing (symbolized in Baptism) are activities pregnant with meaning. Calvin is surely correct to say that these two visual signs do really reveal God, but not in silence: 'The Sacrament requires preaching to beget faith'.<sup>15</sup> Making the sacraments an end in themselves—which was one of the problems against which the Reformers fought in the Mediaeval Church—tends to put the sacrament above the word: the visual above the verbal. The desire for immanence led to the notion that Christ was really present in the elements. It led to building of icons which looked for tangible reality in what was seen. Such an approach to the sacraments, in the minds of the Reformers, made the visible the end rather than the means.

God is only immanent through His Word. The sacraments are the 'visible words of Christ'—aids to lead us to Him. The fact that they are public and visible is precisely because Jesus' death was public and visible. The sacraments allow us by faith to partake in what Christ did THEN.

Television does not encourage us to go beyond sight. On the rare occasions I spend an evening in front of the television I invariably come away with a feeling of restlessness. Far from stimulating me to think and act, precisely the opposite has happened: I have *watched* people thinking and acting and that has been enough, it seems. Television watching locks me into time and the visual. In its very nature it cannot spur me on to see the unseen, or contemplate the eternal.

### **d. Truth is beyond sight**

Television seems to want to make visible that which is beyond the realms of sight. Can television take us beyond observation?

Certainly 'Truth' cannot be seen. It belongs to an order beyond sight. Why can T(t)ruth not be seen? Partly because of the very nature of God. Partly because of sin (we WILL see God). Partly because of the nature of thought processes which work on a sequential logical form of a different order to sight. When we look, we do not see linearly: We look—and then we look again. Rather like a film, if you slow down the frames you see a series of 'now' points, which when shown in fast sequence gives the appearance of being continuous. But a clever editor can soon show us that sight alone does not give the continuity.

## 1. Truth about God

Christian revelation works from God down. It is popular to build natural theologies around texts like Psalm 19, Romans 1. Karl Barth was surely right to say that there is no knowledge of God through creation: that is, if we define knowledge in the intimate way which the Scripture does. Psalm 19 reminds us that God has revealed Himself through the spectacle of nature—as powerful, trustworthy and immortal: but the psalmist does not say that creation points to the existence of God, nor that creation endears people towards a belief in God's Truth. Why not? The spectacle of nature is in fact only understandable if we put on the spectacles of special revelation. Calvin spoke about the fact that we learn to see only after conversion—though God's invisible nature and Divine Power are always viewable in creation they now merely stand to condemn our blindness and render us without excuse before God.

Hence the Christian will want to be in the natural world, wondering at the beauty of the creation—and not even looking at it second hand through the antenna! But the awe at the beauty of the created world will only naturally arise when we know the creator: THEN we will see!

## 2. Second-hand sight?

I went for a walk in the woods a few weeks ago, trying to put my own advice into practice, and was struck at just how restless my eyes had become. I thought I was going out to enjoy the beauty of creation and worship its maker, but I found that my eye was constantly craving stimulation, unable to appreciate the wonder of what was there. In an age which prefers to talk about environment rather than creation, Os Guinness's words are perceptive: 'We do not see the environment, we see with it'.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, neither shall we 'see' God in the natural world, until we 'see' Him behind the natural.

What sort of environment do we see when we look at it through television-educated eyes?

- A world of soap-operas where problems are solved inside half an hour;
- A world of pop music in which marketing the video image is, perhaps, more important than the quality of the song;
- A world of advertising where 'See, want and get' are the hallmarks;
- A world of Newsmakers which bring the world to my living room, but do not give me time or a context in which to interpret what I see.

Compare this television view of reality with the Biblical view of reality. The contrast is marked. According to the Bible:

- Now is not all that matters;
- Seeing is not necessarily believing;
- A picture may not be worth a thousand words.

Will we make Commercial television at home?

**SIMON VIBERT** is the curate in the parish of Houghton and Kingmoor, Carlisle, and a part-time M. Th. student at Glasgow University. He spent a year

## NOTES

- 1 'Decalogue' is made up of the words *deka* meaning 'ten' and *logos* meaning 'word'. Hence the commandments are literally ten words from God.
- 2 Although we do of course need to appreciate that the Word—as the way God communicates—does not have clinical, abstract or rationalistic meaning. The Word involves communication through relationship. The Word gives life. See Deuteronomy 30:32.
- 3 See Psalm 119:105; John 1:9, 8:12; Deuteronomy 30:15f.; 32:45b–47; John 1:4; John 6:40; *etc.*
- 4 Jacques Ellul notes the irony in the fact that the earrings—which are made to adorn the ear, the organ of receiving speech—are melted down to make an image which delights and pleases the eye. *The Humiliation of the Word* p. 90ff.
- 5 Paul returns to expanding the theme of 'futility of life' in Romans 8, where even after regeneration the Christian and the whole creation groan awaiting the redemption of the body.
- 6 Jacques Ellul, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
- 7 The Greek word *eikonos* shows that Paul has actual visual idolatry in mind: forms of man and birds. In the Old Testament 'image' and 'idol' are often used interchangeably (*cf.* Isaiah 10:10f.). See further C. E. B. Cranfield *The International Critical Commentary 'Romans'*, Vol. I, p. 119.
- 8 Neil Postman *Amusing ourselves to death* Penguin Books, New York, p. 99ff.
- 9 'It is the office of faith to believe what we do not see, and it shall be the renewal of faith to see what we do believe.' Thomas Adams.
- 10 Ellul's vocabulary is confusing. The force of his words is to read 'reality' as 'appearance'. And 'Truth' as 'Truth/reality'.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 79f.
- 12 Malcolm Muggeridge, *Christ and the Media*, Hodder and Stoughton, London 1977, p. 60.
- 13 *The Broadcasting Act 1981* Section 4.3.
- 14 Dick Keyes, *What in the World is Real*, quoting Roman and Maas, *How to Advertise*, p. 81.
- 15 John Calvin, *The Institutes of Christian Religion*, F. L. Battles (translator) and J. T. McNeill (Editor), Westminster Press, Philadelphia and S.C.M. Press, London. 4:14:4, p. 1279.
- 16 Quoted in *Idols for Destruction*, H. Schlossberg, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, 1983, p. 7.