

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>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSEF BULLETIN

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1986
VOL. 10, NO. 2
\$4.50

Introducing This Issue <i>Vernon Grounds</i>	3
Finis to Fratricide <i>Vernon Grounds</i>	4
Evangelical Diversity and Self-Criticism: Signs of Hope <i>Thomas F. Johnson</i>	8
Our Shared Evangelical Heritage <i>Timothy L. Smith</i>	10
The Black Contribution To Evangelicalism <i>James Earl Massey</i>	16
The Authority of the Bible: What Shall We Then Preach? <i>Paul J. Achtemeier</i>	19
The American Hour, The Evangelical Moment <i>Os Guinness</i>	22
CONFERENCE REPORTS:	
North American Evangelical Missions: The Last 100 Years <i>Marvin Bergman</i>	24
Missiology Students Form Society <i>Thomas Russell</i>	26
The Case of <i>Brave New People</i>: A Shadow and a Hope <i>Stephen Charles Mott</i>	27
Abortion: Four Reviews	31
Book Reviews and Comments	34

A Publication of
**THEOLOGICAL
STUDENTS
FELLOWSHIP**

Finis To Fratricide

by Vernon C. Grounds

In I Corinthians 11:22, Paul raises an intriguing question: "Do you despise the church of God?" Our response, of course, is unhesitating and emphatic: by no means! Instead of despising the church, we prize it and are inexpressibly grateful to God for its ministry. Yet we must listen attentively to the criticisms of church-despisers in order to more effectively carry out our Savior's mandate to evangelize the world.

One criticism which the church-despisers direct against us is that of *mythology*. They charge that we subscribe to beliefs which are simply incredible. We believe not only in the reality of the supernatural, the possibility of miracle, and the divine authority of an accidental collection of Semitic documents. We also, the church-despisers scoff, believe in the infallibility of Moses, the edibility of Jonah and probably the superiority of American society.

For a second thing, the church-despisers charge us with *apathy*. We talk grandiosely about transforming the world and getting the will of God done in space and time. But by and large our churches are narcissistic groups of uninvolved individuals, members who are concerned about their own souls, marriages and families, and who consequently devote energy and money to self-centered edification and amusement.

The church-despisers also level against us the charge of *hypocrisy*. They point out the discrepancy between our profession and our practice, our belief and our behavior, our creed and our conduct. Love, unity, and compassion may be our watchwords, but we fail to incarnate our high ideals. Christians, the church-despisers claim, are not conspicuous for their sacrificial loyalty to biblical principles.

Fourth, the church-despisers charge us with *bigotry*. We split hairs over even nonessentials and assert that our views are in precise alignment with the mind of God Almighty. Who among us will deny that a spirit of intolerance characterizes large segments of evangelicalism—not simply and understandably with respect to the historic centralities of the gospel, but likewise with respect to the very debatable distinctives of our separate denominations?

Still further, they charge us with *disunity*. How often we sing the well-known words:

*We are not divided, all one body we,
One in hope and doctrine, one in charity.*

Yet the very same hymn includes this stanza:

*Yet with a sorry wonder, men see her sore-oppressed,
By schism rent asunder, by heresy distressed.*

The scandal of Christianity from early on has been its disunity, its failure to fulfill its Lord's entreaty, "May they all be one as we, Father, are one" (John 17:21).

A satirical poet whose identity I have thus far been unable to ascertain observed the divisiveness among Christians and expressed what he interpreted as the attitude of at least some of the churches:

*We are the Lord's elected few. Let all the rest be damned!
There'll be no room up there for you. We don't want heaven
crammed.*

I often recall that contentious handful of saints, a splintered group which erected a sign with movable letters outside its

meeting-place. It announced to passers-by, "Jesus Only." But after a night of violent wind that sign read, "Us Only." When the church universal is reduced to a splinter of schism, who can blame our critics for their scorn?

Leaving aside all the other criticisms, let us zero in on the charge that evangelicalism has been and still is marked by disunity. What can we do to blunt the painfully sharp edge of justifiable criticism? More than that, however, what can we do in order to achieve in fuller measure the openness of his body for which our Savior pleaded? I am persuaded that what we need to do is become full-fledged biblicists, allowing the Scripture to dynamically control our practice as well as to theoretically shape our beliefs. I am convinced that the antidote to fratricidal disunity is found in the fourteenth chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans. Here are principles which, if they become operative in our churches, will bring a finis to ecclesiastical conflict. On the contrary, if we fail to put these principles into practice, I anticipate many a tragic rerun of our past divisiveness.

Though the background of this pivotal passage is probably familiar to all of us, suppose I review it very hastily. In the capitol of the Caesars is a church composed of both Jews and Gentiles. Some members of this mixed congregation have been reared on an Old Testament diet. As a result they find it impossible to shake off life-long taboos, especially taboos grounded in their sincere loyalty to the Word of God. They look upon the indiscriminate eating of meat as an act of disobedience to the Mosaic law and therefore an act of disobedience to Jehovah. They view the keeping of the Sabbath and other sacred days as a matter of conscientious piety. Thus they are vegetarians and Sabbatarians. They form the party of weak believers, genuine Christians who have not yet grasped the pure graciousness and liberating spirituality of the gospel. By no means inferior in character or commitment, they are nevertheless immature, bound by custom and ignorance and prejudice.

In the church at Rome, however, there are other believers who do not practice the taboos of these weaker Christians. The strong Christians, as Paul designates them, have come to see the full meaning of the gospel. They have come to see that the Old Testament regulations concerning unholy foods and holy days were wiped out by the sacrifice of Calvary. They have come to see that they are living under grace, and the keynote of grace is freedom from all legalism. They have come to see, accordingly, that a surrender to legalism is a betrayal of the gospel.

Now each party is dogmatic, convinced that it alone possesses the truth and that the rival party is wrong, dead wrong. So with these two factions in the same church, there is danger that civil war will suddenly erupt like a volcano. How, then, does Paul handle this explosive situation? Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he lays down principles which, if put into practice, are guaranteed to prevent ecclesiastical civil war. What are these peace-producing principles?

I

We must extend the hand of fellowship to Christians who differ with ourselves concerning those matters of belief and behavior that Scripture leaves unsettled. Notice Romans 14:1-4:

Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing

judgment on disputable matters. One man's faith allows him to eat everything, but another man, whose faith is weak, eats only vegetables. The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God accepted him. Who are you to judge someone else's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. And he will stand, for the Lord is able to make him stand.

In either case, however, Paul turns on a red light. Break the nasty habit of name-calling, he orders his readers. Stop pinning labels, which are probably libels, on your brothers and sisters. Remember that, when you indulge in either despising or criticizing your fellow Christian, you are guilty of pride, self-righteousness and contempt. Remember too that, when you despise or criticize, you stir up bitterness and hatred and strife. You become the Devil's stooge. Thus from here on out, instead of despising or criticizing, exercise respect and

When the church universal is reduced to a splinter of schism, who can blame our critics for their scorn?

Notice also chapter 15:7 (for we cannot isolate chapter 14 from its context in the Roman letter): "Accept one another, then, just as Christ accepted you, in order to bring praise to God."

What is Paul's explicit directive? Welcome your brothers and sisters in the faith even though, as you understand your faith, they are weak and immature, holding to opinions and practices which are wrong—at least in your opinion. Yes, welcome the weak brothers and sisters precisely because they are brothers and sisters. They too have sincere faith in Jesus Christ as the incarnate Son of God who died for our sins and rose again in Easter victory. God has therefore accepted them into the membership of the true church, and hence you must not reject them, wrong as they may be concerning some matters. Welcome them, Paul commands us, provided they have a sincere faith in the centralities of the gospel. Welcome them despite their ignorance or stubbornness or prejudice or misunderstanding or maybe downright stupidity. Welcome them, and then refrain from unedifying controversy about those things which Scripture leaves unsettled.

Now what does this mean for us? What does it mean unless it means that fellowship in the gospel of Jesus Christ does not demand an absolute uniformity of viewpoint and interpretation? What does it mean unless it means that fellowship in the gospel of Jesus Christ is compatible with sincere differences of opinion? What does it mean unless it means, as Protestants have historically contended, that when God leaves an issue open we have no authority to close it by ecclesiastical mandate? So the first principle Paul lays down is this: fraternize, don't ostracize! Make the centralities of our faith your platform for fellowship, and guard against making toothpicks for planks!

II

Second, we must exercise respect, courtesy and tolerance. Paul lays down this directive in the third verse: "The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him." The apostle realizes that a strong believer who is emancipated from old scruples and prejudices may indulge in sarcastic criticism of weaker brothers and sisters. He or she may label them narrow-minded prudes or hair-splitting legalists or straight-laced Pharisees or creaking traditionalists or unenlightened mossbacks. Such persons may poke fun at their old-fashioned fundamentalism. But, on the other hand, the vegetarian or the Sabbatarian, the conscientious abstainer, may denounce the stronger brothers and sisters as unspiritual rebels or low-living libertines or high-minded intellectuals or inflated egotists or perhaps camouflaged liberals.

courtesy and tolerance.

III

We must resolutely refuse to push God aside and pass judgment on another Christian's motives. I call your attention again to verses three and four:

The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him. Who are you to judge someone else's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. And he will stand, for the Lord is able to make him stand.

I call your attention also to verse ten: "You, then, why do you judge your brother or why do you look down on your brother? For we will stand before God's judgment seat." Again, look at verse thirteen: "Therefore let us stop passing judgment on one another. Instead, make up your mind not to put any stumbling block or obstacle in your brother's way."

Oh, how subtle, how chronic is the temptation to usurp the prerogatives of God Almighty! As if we were omniscient! As is in our finitude we could possibly know whether or not our fellow believers are being true to their own deepest insights, loyal to that interpretation of Scripture which they have been able to attain! As if we could possibly know all the forces and factors which are motivating the behavior of our brothers and sisters? No! No! No! What Paul assumes, therefore, is the integrity of his fellow believers. He takes it for granted that his fellow believers are motivated spiritually, not carnally. Yes, Paul operates on the premise that his fellow believers are motivated by a desire to please God. That surely is the point of verse six:

He who regards one day as special, does so to the Lord. He who eats meat, eats it to the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who abstains, does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God.

So unless fellow believers are guilty of heresy or immorality in plain contradiction of Scripture, I must refuse to judge their motivation. I must steadfastly decline to play the role which belongs exclusively to our omniscient God.

IV

We must insist on the right, indeed the inescapable obligation of personal responsibility. How emphatically Paul says this in verse five: "One man considers one day more sacred than another; another man considers every day alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind." How emphatically he likewise says this in verse twelve: "So then, each of us will give an account of himself to God." And here, as we

all perceive, is the biblical foundation of our great Protestant distinctive, the sovereignty of the individual soul, the right and duty of every human being to establish a first-hand relationship with the Creator who will ultimately be his or her Judge. I cannot breathe for my brother; he must do his own breathing. Neither can I think for my sister, decide for my brother, trust for my sister or die for my brother. They must do their own thinking and deciding and trusting and dying. Consequently, I cannot answer for my brothers and sisters, nor can they answer for me.

To be sure, they may help me, and I may help them. We may share our opinions—or merely pool our ignorance and prejudice. Each of us may prayerfully seek to instruct, persuade and correct the other. But in the end I must make up my own mind before God. I must stand on my own feet before God. I must answer for my own life to God. And my brothers and sisters must do the same.

In view of this awesome and inescapable fact, Paul urges

No Christian must be pressured to agree with an opinion or a practice which her own conscience cannot sincerely accept. No Christian must be coerced by a crowd, even if the crowd is a church congregation.

us to insist on the right of personal responsibility.

V

We must hold fast to the inviolability of conscience; and this is, obviously, a corollary of the tremendous fact which I have just been discussing: our personal responsibility before God.

What is the thrust of verse fourteen? "As one who is in the Lord Jesus, I am fully convinced that no food is unclean in itself. But if anyone regards something as unclean, then for him it is unclean." The thrust of this text is plain. The conscience must be obeyed even if it is weak and warped and wrong. This theme is repeated in verse twenty: "Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food. All food is clean, but it is wrong for a man to eat anything that causes someone else to stumble." This theme reemerges in verses twenty-two and twenty-three:

So whatever you believe about these things keep between yourself and God. Blessed is the man who does not condemn himself by what he approves. But the man who has doubts is condemned if he eats, because his eating is not from faith; and everything that does not come from faith is sin.

If people violate their own conscience, Paul asserts, sin is being committed. Such people are wrong even though what is being done is right. Suppose a man does something which is right and yet, as he does the right thing, he senses that he is doing wrong; then he is wrong even though the thing he does is right. Hence no Christian must be pressured to agree with an opinion or a practice which her own conscience cannot sincerely accept. No Christian must be coerced by a crowd, even if the crowd is a church congregation. No Christian must be forced to compromise conviction for the sake of tradition. Granted that she may be shortsighted or stubborn or sinful. She must nevertheless hold fast to the truth as she sees it; and there is no power that can enable her to see the truth differently except the power of the illuminating Holy Spirit.

Let me sharpen the issue. A brother may sincerely believe in the ordination of women; and we don't agree. A sister may fervently believe in all five points of Calvinism, passionately defending double predestination; and we don't agree. A brother

may believe in *laissez faire* capitalism as a good and necessary deduction from certain biblical texts and principles; and we don't agree. A sister may believe that abortion under specific circumstances is the lesser of two evils; and we don't agree. A brother may believe that the advent of the nuclear age necessitates pacifism and our country's unilateral disarmament; and we don't agree. A sister may believe that neighbor concern gives support to the enforced busing of school children; and we don't agree. A brother may believe in racial segregation as practiced in South Africa; and we don't agree. A sister may believe that capital punishment is inconsistent with the pro-life stance; and we don't agree. A brother may believe that the Genesis account is compatible with theistic evolution; and we don't agree. If our brothers and sisters honestly deduce from Scripture beliefs and practices which we are convinced are wrong, we must grant them the right to hold those convictions. Indeed, we must protect their right to be wrong. We will no doubt struggle to straighten out (as we

view it) their corkscrew logic. We will challenge their exegesis and indicate the baleful consequences of the teaching they are espousing. We may be conscientiously unable to become members of their churches. But we will not leave them out of the church which is Christ's body. We will not repudiate their claim to be children of God. No, instead of that, we will joyfully acknowledge that all of us belong to the same spiritual family. We will champion their loyalty to that inner monitor which whispers to every human being, "Whatever you believe wrong ought not be done; whatever you believe right ought to be done though the world oppose you." In short, as Christians obedient to Scripture we must affirm the inviolability of conscience.

VI

We must acknowledge the lordship of Christ in all our interactions. Is there in all the New Testament any other passage which trumpets the sovereignty of our Savior more eloquently than verses seven through eleven of this chapter?

For none of us lives to himself alone and none of us dies to himself alone. If we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die to the Lord. For this very reason, Christ died and returned to life so that he might be the Lord of both the dead and the living. You, then, why do you judge your brother? Or why do you look down on your brother? For we will all stand before God's judgement seat. It is written, "'As surely as I live,' says the Lord, 'every knee will bow before me; every tongue will confess to God.'"

By the sacrifice of the cross, by his Easter victory, Jesus Christ, once despised, disgraced, and seemingly defeated, is now enthroned as cosmic King. The totality of existence is under his rulership, all of life and all of death, this world and the next world, present and future, time and eternity, everything is under His rulership. Therefore whether we eat and drink, whether we fast and pray, no matter what we do, we must do it for the sake of Jesus Christ. In everything, we must strive to please our Lord. I must not do what I please. I must not do what my church or denomination pleases. I must do what pleases my Lord. I must seek his will, his glory, his

approval in everything even if, in pleasing him, I displease you.

And I must unreservedly confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord of my brother's life, the Lord of my sister's heart, the Lord of my brother's service. I did not die for my brothers and sisters; Jesus Christ did. My brothers and sisters do not belong to me; they belong to Jesus Christ. So my brothers and sisters must not please me, they must please Jesus Christ, just as in everything I, too, the bondslave of the Savior, must seek to please my Lord and Master.

standards in the United States. Times were changing, and the step away from Victorian legalism was all for the better.

In my opinion, that is the stand we must take against all legalism, Victorian or otherwise. We must defend the blood-purchased liberty of the gospel.

VIII

Finally, we must live by the law of love. Paul asserts this in

If Scripture is silent concerning the issue, we must never, never, never allow a human opinion to be imposed on us if it were a divine norm.

VII

We must defend the liberty of the Gospel. Consider what Paul writes in verse fourteen: "As one who is in the Lord Jesus, I am fully convinced that no food is unclean in itself. But if anyone regards something as unclean, then for him it is unclean." Next add verse seventeen: "For the kingdom of God is not a matter of eating and drinking, but of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Now observe the very heart of verse twenty: "All food is clean, but it is wrong for a man to eat anything that causes someone else to stumble." In other words, we must keep on affirming that the gospel spells the death of legalism. Our relationship to God is not a matter of externalities. Salvation is neither obtained nor retained by what we do or fail to do. Salvation is purely a matter of faith in redeeming grace. Consequently, we must resist steadfastly any attempt to introduce human merit, gained by lawkeeping, as a condition of justification or sanctification. To be sure, we must make concessions to immaturity and prejudice, but we must never, never, never allow the gospel to be undercut by legalism. So understand me when I repeat what I was emphasizing before: if Scripture is silent concerning the issue, we must never, never, never allow a human opinion to be imposed on us if it were a divine norm. Here I think we can learn a salutary lesson from Donald Gray Barnhouse, that gifted and forthright expositor of God's Word. Allow me to share with you a simple and, I think, amusing anecdote from his multi-volume commentary on the Roman Letter:

Many years ago, I led a Bible Conference at Montrose, Pennsylvania. About 200 young people were present, and a few older people. One day two old ladies complained to me in horror because some of the girls were not wearing stockings; these ladies wanted me to rebuke them. This was about the year 1928. Looking them straight in the eye, I said, "The Virgin Mary never wore stockings." They gasped and said, "She didn't?" I answered, "In Mary's time, stockings were unknown. So far as we know, they were first worn by prostitutes in Italy in the 15th century, when the Renaissance began. Later, a lady of the nobility wore stockings at a court ball, greatly to the scandal of many people. Before long, however, everyone in the upper classes was wearing stockings, and by the time of Queen Victoria stockings had become the badge of the prude." These ladies, who were holdovers from the Victorian epoch, had nothing more to say. I did not rebuke the girls for not wearing stockings. A year or two afterward, most girls in the United States were going without stockings in the summer, and nobody thought anything about it. Nor do I believe that this led towards disintegration of moral

verse fifteen which might better be translated: "Now you are living by the law of love." He asserts this likewise in chapter thirteen, verses eight through ten:

Let no debt remain outstanding, except the continuing debt to love one another, for he who loves his fellow man has fulfilled the law. The commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not steal," "Do not covet," and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: "Love your neighbor as yourself." Love does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

If I live by the law of love, I will not scandalize my brothers and sisters. This is the burden of the 14th chapter and verse thirteen: "Therefore let us stop passing judgement on one another. Instead, make up your mind not to put any stumbling block or obstacle in your brother's way." If I live by the law of love, I will not grieve my brothers and sisters. This is the burden of the fifteenth verse in this same chapter. "If your brother is distressed because of what you eat, you are no longer acting in love. Do not by your eating destroy your brother for whom Christ died." If I live by the law of love, I will not offend or weaken or destroy my brothers and sisters. This is the burden of verses 20 and 21: "Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food. All food is clean, but it is wrong for a man to eat anything that causes someone else to stumble. It is better not to eat meat or drink wine or to do anything else that will cause your brother to fall."

Thus, motivated by love, I will avoid doing anything that is going to hurt my brothers and sisters or bring them under the chastening judgment of Jesus Christ. Rather than scandalizing them, I will make these sacrifices which promote harmony and produce edification. This is the burden of verse nineteen: "Let us therefore make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification." Motivated by love, I will make any sacrifice—except the sacrifice of God's truth—to help my brothers and sisters become more like Jesus Christ, experiencing righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Motivated by love, I will carry out verse 22: "Do you have faith? Have it to yourself before God." Thus I will not pugnaciously insist on the acceptance of my opinions. I will soft-pedal my prejudices. I will forego some of my liberties, if by doing so I can prevent my brother from losing out spiritually.

These are the eight principles which the Holy Spirit lays down through Paul, principles which, if put into operation, will prevent any future outbreak of ecclesiastical civil war.

Pastor Martin Niemoller was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp. As Christmas 1944 dawned, the Dachau authorities, who had denied Protestants the right to worship,

relented and ordered Niemoller to conduct a service. He writes of that event:

There were seven of us: a British colonel, a Dutch minister of war, two Norwegian ship-owners, a Yugoslav diplomatist and a Macedonian journalist, and me, the Lutheran pastor from Germany. When I realized what a task I should have to fulfill, I felt embarrassed and even desperate; for how should I—the German—find the right way to the hearts of this congregation, to men who hated Germany and Germans and who could not do otherwise?

But a sort of minor miracle happened. As Niemoller has recorded:

At noontime before Christmas Eve somebody knocked at my door. The cell was opened, and in came the Dutch minister of war with the Gestapo guard. "Good morn-

ing, pastor," he said. "I am just dropping in to ask you something. My comrades and I myself want to celebrate Holy Supper with you tonight after your sermon. You may be astonished, but we could not help asking you." In this way it happened that in the evening I preached my sermon: "Glory be to God in heaven and peace on earth to men of good will!" And peace there was when we knelt down, seven people of different nations, divided by hatred and war, but now united and bound together by the love of God and by the grace of Jesus Christ. The small cell widened, walls and wires disappeared. We felt liberated and, in a flash, we saw God's promise fulfilled: "Peace on Earth."

My brothers and sisters, let us pray and work to the end that our churches may be healingly "united and bound together by the love of God and the grace of Jesus Christ."

Evangelical Diversity and Self-Criticism: Signs of Hope

by Thomas F. Johnson

Nearly two hundred evangelical leaders gathered June 4-6, 1986, at Eastern College, St. Davids, Pennsylvania, for the third annual Evangelical Roundtable. The topic was "Evangelicalism: Surviving Its Success." In his opening remarks, Robert Seiple, president of the college and of Eastern Baptist Seminary, which sponsored the conference, welcomed those present, encouraged discernment, open dialogue, and understanding among the conferees, and warned them against dogmatism. A similar theme was sounded by *TSF Bulletin* editor Vernon Grounds in the morning Bible studies on Romans 14 and 15.

Roots Of Social Concern

Johns Hopkins historian Timothy L. Smith led off a lineup of heavy-hitting addresses by providing a historical overview of evangelical involvement in "social idealism" (see article, p. 10). Evangelicals were in the forefront of liberation movements in the 19th century (women's rights, defense of the poor, anti-slavery, free public schools, etc.) He demonstrated that contemporary evangelical social concern has deep roots in their nineteenth century ancestors' passion for the kingdom of God.

Southern Baptists

Roy Honeycutt, president of embattled Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, asked whether success would destroy the SBC. Documenting both its successes and its divisions, he warned that the Lord of history will judge the church with a divine perspective on success. Southern Baptists, he said, are a people searching for a new identity, with the loss of both the cultural and programmatic syntheses that have held the denomination together in the past. Will the new theological synthesis currently being "forced" by more conservative leaders work? "Not in my lifetime and certainly not in my tenure as president of Southern Seminary," Honeycutt vowed.

Feminist Concerns

One of the highlights of the conference was the clash of

feminist perspectives represented by Elouise Fraser, Eastern Baptist Seminary theologian, and Elizabeth Achtemeier, Old Testament professor from Union Seminary, Virginia. Fraser struck hard against the sin of paternalism among evangelicals, the "fathers"-know-best attitude that stifles theology and leads to fruitless battles over inerrancy and creationism. "Do not marginalize the concerns of evangelical feminists," she warned.

Achtemeier, while asserting the bias against women in the church is a scandal, saved her strongest words for feminist theology itself, which, she said, by insisting on the use of female terms for God, is leading the church to a religion other than Christianity, a Canaanite goddess religion, that unifies creation with Creator and ultimately makes human history meaningless.

Black Perspective

A black evangelical perspective was brought by Tuskegee Institute professor James Earl Massey (see article, p. 16). He noted that black churches are almost universally evangelical and that they have contributed to the movement in five ways: (1) by proving that Christianity is not a white man's religion (2) by a rich, musical heritage (3) through an active witness against racism (4) through celebrative and radical preaching and (5) by taking leadership in urban ministry. When asked why there is such a low visibility of blacks in evangelical theology, Massey replied, "Blacks and whites have had different agendas: whites have been preoccupied with theologizing, blacks with doing things."

Evangelism

Evangelism was the primary concern of the first evening. Jay Kesler, former Youth for Christ national director and now president of Taylor University, spoke on "Jesus, Rambo and the Gates of Hell." He maintained that there are millions of pagan young people in America today with no personal or family ties to the church. YFC learned that they cannot be reached by youth who have grown up in the church and in Christian homes; rather, it takes an ex-pagan to reach a pagan. He warned that instead of taking on the new challenges of evangelism, the evangelical movement is succumbing to the siren song of civil religion. Both Jesus and Rambo are being

Thomas F. Johnson is Professor of New Testament at North American Baptist Seminary.