

CONTENTS

LOVE AND HATE (WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON RIGHTEOUS HATRED)	John K. Pfeiffer
PAIDEIA: FROM A PASTOR'S AND PROFESSOR'S NOTEBOOK	Roland A. Gurgel
BOOK REVIEWS:	
Luther the Reformer: The Story of the Man and His Career, by James Kittleson Reviewer: Ralph Schaller	
Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation, by James Davison Hunter Reviewer: D. Lau	
Unmasking the New Age, by Douglas R. Groothuis	
The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church, by Malachi Martin Reviewer: C. Kuehne	

LOVE AND HATE
(With Special Emphasis on Righteous Hatred)

John K. Pfeiffer

While in the process of preparing an article on Rev. 2:1ff. for the Journal of Theology, it became necessary for me to make some cross-references on the words "love" and "hate." Coupled with this was a study of the book of Psalms for Bible Class. These two studies brought me face to face with certain passages which state that God hates some person or that the author of a Psalm hates someone: "Thou dost hate all who do iniquity" (Ps. 5:5); "Do I not hate those who hate Thee?" (Ps. 139:21).

How can hatred exist in the heart of One, whom Scripture describes with the word "love"? ("God is love" 1 John 4:8.) What are these things called "love" and "hate"?

As we begin, I offer the following propositions as the basis for our study:

1. Love is an attitude of the heart, a stance which the heart assumes relative to a person or thing, which produces the desire to be close to, to have constant fellowship with, that person or thing.
2. Hate is an attitude of the heart, a stance which the heart assumes relative to a person or thing, which produces the desire to have nothing to do with that person or thing.
3. While love and hate do produce emotional feelings, they should not be equated with those feelings.
4. Love and hate are not passive attitudes but attitudes which generate activity and are often identified by the activity which each generates.
5. In comparing a greater love to a lesser love, Scripture sometimes identifies the lesser love as hate, because it appears to be so to the one experiencing the generated activity.

PROPOSITION #1 - LOVE IS AN ATTITUDE OF THE HEART, A STANCE WHICH THE HEART ASSUMES RELATIVE TO A PERSON OR THING, WHICH PRODUCES THE DESIRE TO BE CLOSE TO, TO HAVE CONSTANT FELLOWSHIP WITH, THAT PERSON OR THING.

It is almost impossible to speak of genuine love without looking first at the love of God. Only in Him can be seen what pure love really is.

In His high priestly prayer, Jesus prayed for all believers: "that they may be one, just as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected in unity, that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and didst love them, even as Thou didst love Me" (John 17:22f.). The love in the heart of God produced the desire to be close to man, to become one with man. However, in order for His desire to become a reality, God had to remove that which stood in the way, that which separated us from Him: "Your iniquities have made a separation between you and your God, and your sins have hidden His face from you, so that He does not hear" (Isa. 59:2). Jesus said to His Father, "Thou didst send Me." The beloved Son of God was sent to take our sins out of the way, so that fellowship with God might be established.

The love of God soars beyond our human comprehension. "Thou didst love Me," said Jesus. Yet, upon the cross He cried, "My God! My God! Why hast Thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46). If love produces the desire for togetherness, how could God forsake His own Son? The answer, of course, is that Christ became sin for us. It was because of this guilt that the Father forsook His own Son. He abandoned Him to the agony of hell: "The cords of death encompassed Me, and the terrors of hell came upon Me; I found distress and sorrow" (Ps. 116:3). Such did the Son of God endure, because He loves us. His love produced the desire to be near to us, and the only way that He could do this was by suffering separation from His Father.

Reconciliation is the result. "God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. . . . while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:8,10). Enemies have become friends; those once separated have been brought together through the payment of an inestimable price. We are more than friends: "See how great a love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are" (1 John 3:1). Such is the love of God, that the desired closeness should be that of a father and child. "I have loved you with an everlasting love; therefore I have drawn you with loving-kindness" (Jer. 31:3).

Among men, the love-produced desire for togetherness with persons or things is evident in such passages as the following:

The soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as himself. (1 Sam. 18:1)

For I have loved strangers, and after them I walk. (Jer. 2:25)

When I found him whom my soul loves, I held on to him and would not let him go. . . . (Song Sol. 3:4)

O how I love Thy Law! It is my meditation all the day. (Ps. 119:97)

I love those who love me [Wisdom]; and those who diligently seek me will find me. (Prov. 8:17)

Every one loves a bribe, and chases after rewards. (Isa. 1:23)

One might object to an unrestricted use of this proposition. How, for instance, would it apply in the command of Christ to love your enemies? (cf. Luke 6:27). If we love our enemies, does this mean that we desire to be close to them? One can only wonder how it is possible to "do good to those who hate" us, if we keep ourselves away from them. The desires of love call for proximity. This does not mean that we desire a closeness that is bristling with hostility. Love desires that the hostility end so that closeness may be established, and it does whatever it can to bring this about.

It may be that this proposition cannot be universally applied; however, in most usages of the word "love" it is applicable.

PROPOSITION #2 - HATE IS AN ATTITUDE OF THE HEART, A STANCE WHICH THE HEART ASSUMES RELATIVE TO A PERSON OR THING, WHICH PRODUCES THE DESIRE TO HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT PERSON OR THING.

When the heart is filled with hatred, it wants to rid itself of a consciousness of the object of its hatred. It may do this by means of a geographical separation from that person or thing: "And Isaac said to them, 'Why have you come to me, since you hate me, and have sent me away from you?'" (Gen. 26:27). It may do this by means of a mental separation, that is, an ignoring of that person or thing, ignoring his existence, ignoring his needs or desires, etc., (cf. priest and Levite in the story of the good Samaritan, Luke 10:30ff.). The heart of hatred may even go so far as to destroy the object of its hatred. If it cannot do any of these, but is forced to endure a geographical proximity to the hated person, then it will do what it can to make life miserable for that person, as if in hopes of driving him away: "Hatred stirs up strife . . ." (Prov. 10:12).

Hatred may not always manifest itself to the human eye so that we can observe the reality of this proposition. There may be times when it would appear that a man is responding to the need of his neighbor through charitable acts. Yet, it is not the need of the neighbor that he is fulfilling, but his own desire for a feeling of self-righteousness, or his desire for praise from others, or his desire for a tax deduction, or some other self-serving purpose. If he can find no selfish reason for performing an act of "charity," he will not do it. Consider the hypocrite: "He who hates disguises it with his lips, but he lays up deceit in his heart. When he speaks graciously, do not believe him, for there are seven abominations in his heart . . . hatred covers itself with guile . . ." (Prov. 26:24-26).

What about the indulgent father? "He who spares his rod hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him diligently" (Prov. 13:24). Can it be that this proposition would apply to him? This father may protest that he loves his son. He may feel an affection toward him. He may engage in all sorts of "fun" activity with his son. He does not loathe him. He is not angry toward him. He performs no acts of violence on him. Yet, in so far as he refuses to respond to his son's need for discipline, he does hate him. According to the proposition, he wants to have nothing to do with his son when it comes to his spiritual welfare. He refuses to expend the time, the energy, and the emotions called for.

PROPOSITION #3 - WHILE LOVE AND HATE DO PRODUCE EMOTIONAL FEELINGS, THEY SHOULD NOT BE EQUATED WITH THOSE FEELINGS.

One might think that love should always produce joy, when it is near the loved one. This may often be so, but there can be times when sorrow is the emotion produced by love. God, whose love for His children cannot be questioned, is grieved every time we sin: "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom ye were sealed for the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30). Likewise, a loving father may grieve over a rebellious son.

When Jesus drove the moneychangers and their animals out of the Temple, was He motivated by love or hate? The Psalmist prophesied, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness . . ." (Ps. 45:7). On this basis, we could say that Jesus' emotions were produced by both love and hate: love for the temple of God, hatred toward the deeds of wickedness.

Anger is an emotion which is usually attributed to hatred. Yet, anger is not hatred. One can have hatred in his heart without feeling anger. Consider the individual of whom James writes: "If a brother or sister is without clothing or in need of daily food, and one of you says to them, 'Go in peace, be warmed and be filled,' and yet you do not give them what is necessary for their body, what use is that?" (Jas. 2:15-16). There appears to be no anger; yet there is hatred, for the speaker is not acting in love. "Whoever has the world's goods, and beholds his brother in need and closes his heart against him, how does the love of God abide in him?" (1 John 3:17).

Loathing is an emotion produced by hatred, but it is not hatred. Hatred can be present without loathing. One who commits adultery hates the object of his adultery, though he may not loathe her. He would never defile her, if he loved her. The fact that loathing often accompanies hatred is shown in the frequent presence of that emotion after the adulterer has satisfied his lust. The hatred was always present, but not the loathing.

While love and hate are usually accompanied by emotional feelings, we ought not equate the emotion with the attitude. Love and hate are attitudes. Each is a disposition of the heart toward a person or thing. The emotions generated by either will depend on the circumstances. An emotion usually associated with one attitude may be generated by the other. Moreover, if a person sees his brother in need and, for some reason or other, does not sense some emotional feeling, he might conclude that he has no love. Yet, this same person may go out of his way to fulfill the needs of his brother, while he himself gains no personal benefit from it. This is love.

Love transcends emotional feelings. It is an attitude of the heart, which remains despite the feelings of the moment, whether joy or sorrow, pain or pleasure. Love does not vanish when the feelings do. Nor does it wait for some feeling to arise before it generates activity. It is the need of the brother which triggers love into action, not the emotion.

Of Jesus, it says, "And seeing the multitudes, He felt compassion for them, because they were distressed and downcast like sheep without a shepherd" (Matt. 9:36). There were other circumstances which also caused Jesus to be filled with compassion. The emotion arose when love was confronted with the circumstance, but the love was there before the emotion. The love was always there.

PROPOSITION #4 - LOVE AND HATE ARE NOT PASSIVE ATTITUDES, BUT ATTITUDES WHICH GENERATE ACTIVITY.

Again we look to God as the supreme example of love. His love for the world was not just a fond-wishing kind of love, but an active love. The love-activity which proceeded from His heart involved the supreme sacrifice: "Greater love has no one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13). The Son of God laid down His life for us. In this activity we see the greatness of His love. Likewise, we see the love of the Father in His sacrifice of His Son: "By this the love of God was manifested in us, that God has sent His only begotten Son into the world so that we might live through Him" (1 John 4:9).

As for hatred, Satan is the supreme example. In the parable of the tares among the wheat, Jesus states that His enemy is the devil (Matt. 13:24ff.). ἐχθρός: "enemy." Its root meaning is "hatred." μισέω is the verb used for "hate." μισέω does not have a noun form. ἐχθρός does not have a verb form. I regard these words as synonymous, except for form. Satan's continuing and deep hatred is revealed in the activity of which Christ speaks: "He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. Whenever he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own nature; for he is a liar, and the father of lies" (John 8:44). By means of a lie, Satan killed Adam and Eve. Ever since that time, he has been seeking to bring death upon every descendant of Adam. This hatred toward the creature is the result of his primary hatred toward God. Since it is impossible for him to direct his hate-activity directly at God, he tries to get at God indirectly by devouring God's foremost creation (cf. 1 Pet. 5:8).

In the passage quoted above, Jesus told the Jews, "You are of your father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father." Having succeeded in turning mankind against God, Satan filled their hearts with the same hatred that he possessed. They, too, began to perform deeds of hatred. The hate in their hearts was not passive, but active, and its activity was directed toward God.

As Proposition #2 states, hate produces the desire to have nothing to do with a person or thing. The sinner wants nothing to do with God and His Word. Most sinners deny the true God and go about to invent gods of their own liking. Thus, in their own minds, they put God away from them selves. As for God's Law, they deliberately set out to violate it.

The fleshly mind is hostile toward God; for it does not subject itself to the Law of God; for it is not even able to do so. (Rom. 8:7)

Everyone who does evil hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. (John 3:20)

And you say, "How I have hated instruction! And my heart spurned reproof." (Prov. 5:12)

Hate-activity is directed against both God and man, just as the Law deals with both. Every violation of the commandments is an activity of hatred toward God or toward man. Basically, even the sins against man are rooted in hatred toward God.

Behold my affliction from those who hate me. . . . (Ps. 9:13)

All who hate me whisper together against me; against me they devise my hurt. (Ps. 41:7)

Men of bloodshed hate the blameless. . . . (Prov. 29:10)

Blessed are you when men hate you, and ostracize you, and heap insults upon you, and spurn your name as evil, for the sake of the Son of Man. (Luke 6:22)

PROPOSITION #5 - IN COMPARING A GREATER LOVE TO A LESSER LOVE, SCRIPTURE SOMETIMES IDENTIFIES THE LESSER LOVE AS HATE, BECAUSE IT APPEARS TO BE SO TO THE ONE EXPERIENCING THE GENERATED ACTIVITY.

As I stood before a certain altar, waiting for the offering to be gathered, I noticed a peculiar thing. The electric bulbs in the altar candles were casting a shadow upon the wall. The peculiar factor is that the bulbs were lit! While giving off a dim light themselves, they were being overwhelmed by the bright spotlights aimed at the altar. Thus, there occurred a seeming contradiction: light-givers casting a shadow.

So it is with the manifestations of love. While a person may love several people at the same time, it may happen that one of those people interprets his love as hate. For instance, a child sees his father give a gift to a brother, while he himself receives nothing. At that moment, the activity of the father appears to be love toward the brother and hate toward him. The greater love made the lesser love appear to be hate.

"So Jacob went in to Rachel also, and indeed he loved Rachel more than Leah, and he served Laban for another seven years. Now the Lord saw that Leah was hated, and He opened her womb, but Rachel was barren" (Gen. 29:30f.). Note that verse thirty states that Jacob had a greater love for Rachel, while verse thirty-one calls the lesser love "hate." (Some translations say that Leah was "unloved," but the Hebrew is אָוֶן, which means "to hate.")

"He who spares his rod hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him diligently" (Prov. 13:24). As was stated before, the indulgent father has a kind of love for his son. Yet, his failure to care truly for the child's moral and spiritual welfare displays a lack of love. In other words, the greater love of the diligent father makes the lesser love of the lax father seem like hatred. It appears as though the latter does not care about his child. Indeed, in this matter he doesn't (cf. comments under Proposition #2).

"'I have loved you,' says the Lord. But you say, 'How hast Thou loved us?' 'Was not Esau Jacob's brother?' declares the Lord. 'Yet I have loved Jacob; but I have hated Esau, and I have made his mountains a desolation, and appointed his inheritance for the jackals of the wilderness'" (Mal. 1:2f.). Here, too, it could be said that, compared to the love which God showed to Jacob, the attitude which He displayed toward Esau could only be construed as hatred.

"If anyone comes to Me, and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:26). In another place, Jesus is quoted as saying, "He who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me" (Matt. 10:37).

Our love for Jesus Christ should be so great that it makes our love for anyone else appear to be hatred. Indeed, it is sometimes construed by others to be just that.

How often we have been accused of a lack of love (i.e., hate) because we follow the Lord's separation principles! When we separate ourselves from those who teach false doctrine or from those who support false teachers, even if they be father or mother, son or daughter, these people think that we hate them. They look at our activity and apply Proposition #2: "Hate is the attitude of the heart, a stance which the heart assumes relative to a person, which produces the desire to have nothing to do with that person." Given the choice of having nothing to do with man or having nothing to do with Christ, the greater love for Christ will cause us to have nothing to do with man. Our love for Christ should be such a bright light that it causes our love for man to cast a shadow.

RIGHTEOUS HATRED _

Much of the foregoing has dealt with love and hate in the hearts of sinful men. Thus, the word "hate" usually conjures up thoughts of evil. However, hate is not always evil, as we have just learned. There are times when hatred is a holy and righteous attitude:

Hate evil, you who love the Lord. (Ps. 97:10)

From Thy precepts I get understanding; therefore I hate every false way. (Ps. 119:104)

I hate and despise falsehood, but I love Thy Law. (Ps. 119:163)

He who hates his life in this world shall keep it to life eternal. (John 12:25)

Such hatred of evil is readily understood by the Christian. His heart assumes a separatistic stance toward evil. He strives to refrain from committing evil. However, because of his perpetually hateful flesh, he frequently falls into sin. When this happens, he hates what he has done and wants to rid himself of his guilt. Paul wrote: "I am doing the very thing I hate" (Rom. 7:15). What a miserable existence, if we found ourselves shackled to that which we hate, to that from which we seek to be separated. "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7:25). It is He who has broken the chains that bind us to sin. He, who "loved righteousness and hated wickedness" (Ps. 45:7), whose hatred of wickedness was a perfect hatred, willingly allowed Himself to be covered with the loathsome burden. His love for sinners far outweighed His hatred of sin. Therefore, "as far as the east is from the west, so far has He removed our transgressions from us" (Ps. 103:12).

Jesus loved sinners, but hated sin. This we can understand. But how do we resolve that love with the following passages:

For Thou art not a God who takes pleasure in wickedness: no evil dwells with Thee. The boastful shall not stand before Thine eyes; Thou dost hate all who do iniquity. Thou dost destroy those who speak falsehood; the Lord abhors the man of bloodshed and deceit. (Ps. 5:4ff.)

The Lord tests the righteous and the wicked, and the one who loves violence His soul hates. Upon the wicked He will rain snares; fire and brimstone and burning wind will be the portion of their cup. (Ps. _ 11:5f.) \

Note well that these passages show hatred in terms of what it does. Proposition #4 states that love and hate are not passive, but are attitudes which generate activity. Scripture often identifies love and hate by the activity which each generates. The activity spoken of in these two passages is one of fierce judgment. The judgment is the final destruction in hell: ". . . shall not stand . . . dost destroy . . . fire and brimstone . . ." This could hardly be viewed as an activity of love.

God has no passive attitudes, emotions, desires, thoughts, or words. That is why we speak of "effective" attitudes, thoughts, etc. They produce an effect. Thus, when Scripture says that "God

remembered His covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Ex. 2:24), this does not mean that the covenant had somehow slipped His mind, but that He brought it to mind for the purpose of acting upon it—in this case by delivering Israel from Egypt. Likewise, we speak of an effective foreknowledge and an effective Word.

The love or hate of God is effective, also. It is an attitude or stance that His heart assumes relative to a person or thing (Prop. #1 and 2); it is an attitude which generates activity (Prop. #4). The love of God produces favorable action, expressing His desire to be in fellowship with the object of His love. His hatred generates opposing action, expressing His desire to have nothing to do with the object of His hatred. The hatred of God caused Him to condemn the world because of its sins. The love of God caused Him to sacrifice His Son for the sins of the world.

Both love and hate exist in the heart of God; it all depends on the perspective from which God views the world. If God looks upon a man from the perspective of the Law, He can only hate him. His heart is set in opposition to that man, because He sees only iniquity. Therefore, He wants nothing to do with that man.

However, if God views a man from the perspective of the Gospel, then His attitude or stance is love. He sees that man through Jesus Christ. From this perspective, all sins are blotted out. God sees him as holy and righteous.

Christ loved the church and gave Himself up for her; that He might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the Word, that He might present to Himself the church in all her glory, having no spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that she should be holy and blameless. (Eph. 5:25ff.)

The status of such a man is changed before the eyes of God (cf. reconciliation). Therefore, God's heart has nothing but love for him. "The Lord loves the righteous" (Ps. 146:8).

When Scripture speaks of the love of God toward sinners, it is always a love inseparably connected to Christ Jesus:

God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son . . . (John 3:16)

God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. (Rom. 5:8)

By this the love of God was manifested in us, that God has sent His only-begotten Son into the world so that we might live through Him. (1 John 4:9)

In connection with Jesus Christ, God loves all men. Without Christ, He hates all men.

Imagine that God draws a huge circle. In the center He places Jesus Christ. Then He says, "All who are in the circle with Jesus will be the objects of My everlasting love. My desire is that all people be there. I have proven this by sacrificing My Son for all. I have sent forth the Gospel to all. I have given My Spirit to draw all into the circle by means of the Gospel. However, all of you who reject the drawing of My Spirit, who deliberately choose to remain outside of the circle, where men love sin and hate righteousness, shall be the objects of My hatred."

There are always those who declare that, since God is love, He will never condemn anyone to an eternity in hell. Let them read about the hatred of God toward sin. He absolutely will not allow the presence of sin in heaven. Those who reject the only way of cleansing that God has provided still have their sins clinging to them (" . . . they have been retained . . ." John 20:23; ". . . shall have been bound in heaven . . ." Matt. 18:18). Therefore, they shall not, can not, be the objects of eternal love in heaven.

Praise be to God that there is a way of cleansing! "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanses us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). Praise be unto God that He has revealed this way to us! Praise be unto God that He has caused us to place our faith in this way! Therefore, we believe and are sure that "if we confess our

sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). On this we base our hope of eternal life: "Much more, then, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him" (Rom. 5:9).

RIGHTEOUS HATRED WITHIN MAN

It is one thing to acknowledge the existence of hatred within the heart of God, for He is holy. Man, however, is sinful. Can there be righteous hatred toward men within the hearts of sinners? David wrote: "Do I not hate those who hate Thee, O Lord? And do I not loathe those who rise up against Thee? I hate them with utmost hatred; they have become my enemies" (Ps. 139:21f.). How does this agree with the words of Christ, who rebuked those who said, "You shall love your neighbor, and hate your enemy" (Matt. 5:43)?

To begin with, there is a difference between one's own enemy and God's enemy. Jesus was speaking of hating one's own, personal enemy. David was speaking of those who set themselves against God.

As for David's personal enemies, one need only study his relationship to King Saul in order to see that David loved his enemies. There was even a time when Joab rebuked David for "loving those who hate you" (2 Sam. 19:6). In Psalm 2, David urges repentance. Therefore, we assume that an inner desire for the conversion of sinners was present in David.

Furthermore, David is not speaking of hatred toward sinners in general. Many times David confessed that he was numbered among the transgressors: "Against Thee, Thee only, I have sinned, and done what is evil in Thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). "I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and my iniquity I did not hide" (Ps. 32:5).

David is speaking of those who knew the God of Israel. They did not hate some vague Creator-God, as do all who are born of the flesh. They hated Jehovah ("LORD"), the Covenant-God of Israel. They deliberately and knowingly rose up in opposition to Him.

In New Testament terms, these are men who are aware of the invitation of the Gospel and who actively oppose it. These are men who speak out against Christ. They knowingly reject the salvation which is by grace alone through faith in Christ Jesus. They speak out against free and full forgiveness.

David declares that he not only hates them, but that his hatred produced a loathing of them. His emotions were stirred by what they were doing. Whether or not David desired their salvation is beside the point, for they had already heard the Gospel and had taken their stand against it.

Hate is an attitude or stance which the heart assumes relative to a person, which causes the heart to desire to have nothing to do with that person (Prop. #2). David wanted nothing to do with these wicked men: "Depart from me, therefore, men of bloodshed" (Ps. 139:19). He counted them as enemies, whom he would actively oppose. He even called upon God to slay them: "O that Thou wouldst slay the wicked, O God" (Ps. 139:19). Note well, however, that David does not take it upon himself to carry out divine vengeance.

It is entirely appropriate for the Christian to place himself in opposition to all who set themselves against Christ. We ought to pray that God would keep them far from us and that He would silence their voices. Indeed, don't we have a loathing for any who deliberately try to stop the spread of the Gospel?

At the same time, we must be careful to leave it to God to determine who the real enemies are, for we cannot read hearts. The presence of our Old Adam and the deceitfulness of Satan can quickly lead us to pray against a "Saul," whom God intends to become a "Paul." We ought to remember that David wrote by inspiration, but we don't. God revealed to him the identities of the true enemies; but our hatred is more general. We simply acknowledge their existence as the deadly tools of Satan and realize that they must be hindered in whatever manner God chooses, for the sake of the Church.

Here, too, as with the hatred of God, the determining factor is Jesus Christ. It was the deliberate, cognizant enemies of the Savior-God whom David hated. They chose to be outside the circle of the beloved and made it their purpose to destroy those within the circle. Toward them David's stance was one of hatred, in which he desired to have nothing to do with them.

How long, O Lord, holy and true, wilt Thou refrain from judging and avenging our blood on those who dwell on the earth? (Rev. 6:9)

Here is the perseverance and the faith of the saints (namely, in the knowledge that the enemies of the Church will be judged and punished). (Rev. 13:10; 14:12)

IN CONCLUSION

Love is a stance which produces the desire to be close to, to have fellowship with a person or thing. Hate is a stance which produces the desire to have nothing to do with a person or thing. These attitudes are usually accompanied by emotional feelings but should not be equated with these feelings. The love or hate may be there all the time, while the feelings are stirred up only by consciousness of a person or thing. Both attitudes are active, and it is this activity which usually causes the object of the activity to deduce the presence of love or hatred.

The only righteous love or righteous hate is that which is connected with Jesus Christ. The love of God toward sinners is based on the sacrifice which Christ made for us. Those who knowingly and deliberately set themselves against this Gospel place themselves under the vengeful hatred of God.

The Christian's love toward friends and enemies is, also, based on the sacrifice which Christ made for all men. He sees them as people for whom Christ died. Therefore, Christ's love constrains him to pray for their conversion and to do all that he can to bring them into contact with the saving Gospel.

Rightly does the Christian hate all who knowingly and deliberately set themselves against the Gospel. Yet, he makes no attempt to read the individual heart, leaving it to God to determine who the deliberate enemies really are.

"There is an appointed time for everything. And there is a time for every event under heaven . . . A time to love, and a time to hate . . ." (Eccles. 3:1,8). May the Lord God fill us with His Holy Spirit, so that we can curb our sinful flesh, which we hate, learning to love that which God loves and to hate that which He hates.

The concluding hymn stanza reveals the proper place of love and hate in the Christian heart:

Preserve, O Lord, Thine honor,
The bold blasphemer smite;
Convince, convert, enlighten,
The souls in error's night.
Reveal Thy will, dear Savior,
To all who dwell below—
Thou Light of all the living—
That men Thy name may know.

(The Lutheran Hymnal, #264:2)

PAIDEIA

From a Pastor's and Professor's Notebook*

* Several months after Prof. Roland Gurgel retired from his active ministry as a professor at Immanuel Lutheran College, we asked if he would consider becoming a regular contributor to our Journal of Theology , particularly its Paideia section. At that time he stated that he would like a year off and would then consider it. We are happy that our former colleague has with this issue begun a series that will be both interesting and edifying. Editor.

PREFACE At the outset let me state that what is to follow comes from marginal notes, from sermon notes, and from mental notes. The intention in setting down these notes is not to produce a polished, finalized, completed product, but rather a thought-directing, a thought-provoking, and a thought-stimulating bit of material that a pastor might find helpful in his own homiletical preparations, for his Bible class preparation, or for his own spiritual benefit.

The form the presentation of these notes is to take may vary. Much of it may be found in the form of phrases, incomplete sentences, and single words offered to act as a trigger to your thought processes and to your curiosity. At other times, it may take on a more conventional, sentence- paragraph construction. However it pours forth from the pen and onto the printed page, it is our prayer that it may be of spiritual benefit for you and through you to those given into your care.

I

Over the past many years the prophecies of Balaam, found in Numbers, chapters 22-24, and a follow-up in chapter 31:8,16, have been of special interest to me, both in my teaching of Old Testament introduction at Immanuel Lutheran College and as a series for Sunday sermons. Most of us, pastors, teachers, and laymen, are familiar with a portion of the fourth of these prophecies. The Words, "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel," are frequently found as a part of Christmas Eve services. To limit our knowledge, however, to these very important words would deprive us of a wealth of comfort found and offered in the entire set of prophecies. Permit me, then, to begin this series of presentations entitled "From a Pastor's and Professor's Notebook" with notes on Numbers 22-24 and 31:8,16.

The two central figures in these chapters, apart from the Lord, are Balak, king of Moab, and Balaam, a "professional" priest. Neither Balak nor Balaam can be classified as servants of the Lord in the narrow sense of that term. Neither belonged to the "people of God" of the Old Testament times.

Balak, king of Moab, a descendant of Lot by Lot's daughter, was confronted by the descendants of Abraham on their way to the land of Palestine. Remember the relationship of Lot to Abraham: the debt of nephew to uncle; given choice of Abraham's land; rescued from Mesopotamian kings; spared from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by reason of Abraham's prayer, etc. Could these things be remembered 400 years later?

Lot was well aware of the promise to Abraham, oft repeated, that the land of Canaan was for Abraham and his seed. Nor was it a secret that Abraham's seed should sojourn in a foreign land for 400 years until the iniquity of the Canaanites should be full. Abraham's descendants well remembered it. How about the Moabites?

The events of the forty previous years were known to Balak. He, too, knew the fear and felt the sting spoken of by God in Exodus 23:27-28, as well as did his people. Should he not have welcomed Israel home to their land? Should he not have given them a helping hand for all the blessings shown to his ancestors? Should he not have realized that the Lord who delivered Israel from Pharaoh and the Amorites had the power to give them Palestine?

But Balak chose to drive them away. He recognized his own limitations and sought help from a "professional" priest. To this heathen king, to this ruler who attempted to thwart the plan of God, the Lord God sent messages through the lips of an unregenerate priest.

NOTE : The Lord has words and advice for leaders of other peoples besides His own chosen nation. The Old Testament is full of words of warning, admonition, and invitation to the kingdoms and their rulers of that time. Look through the chapters of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Jonah, to name but a few. There you will find many pages of Scripture directed to others besides Israel. God is a God of the whole world—interested in the whole world—in the people of the world—**and in the relationship of the peoples and nations of this world to His own people** , the descendants of Abraham

according to the spirit, the believers. One difference in the Balak situation—the Lord uses an unregenerate, "professional" priest to bring His message; usually in Old Testament times God's Word came by the mouth or the hand of a God-converted and called prophet, a man of God in the full meaning of that term.

Balaam : We have used the expression regarding Balaam that he was a "professional" priest. He was not of the children of Israel. He was not a descendant of Aaron. He was not a type of Christ in his priestly office. He seems to have been a student of the religions of his day. It appears that he was well versed in the teachings of the beliefs of the various nations. Although his home territory was Mesopotamia (some say along the Euphrates river; others would put his home country in Assyria along the Tigris), he was well known for apparent great powers (as far south and west as Moab)—not surprising since there was much contact between Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Egypt in those days, as also today.

Balak concluded that this man would be familiar enough with the ways of the Israelites and their God to aid him in bringing them to a halt in their march toward Palestine. Balaam did have some knowledge of the God of Israel: enough to know that He was a force to be reckoned with, a power not to be taken lightly, a God who could hold him accountable. The source of his knowledge? The deliverance from Egypt was not done in secret; the forty years of wandering did not go unnoticed; the preserving of this great multitude in the desert must have been spoken of in amazement more than once. A far more direct revelation was given him by God when the messengers of Balak arrived. God spoke to him directly; God spoke to him through the donkey. God put words on his tongue—words that reveal much concerning the Lord and His relationship to His people—words that stood there as an invitation to Balaam to join that people—words that we shall look at in more detail in paragraphs to come.

But Balaam, while in outward compliance with the command of God, inwardly rebelled. He refused to heed the words the Lord placed on his tongue: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his" (Num. 23:10b). Balaam did not die the death of the righteous; rather, in stubborn refusal to see what the Lord had to give, he counseled the Midianites how to ensnare Israel in sin: "These caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord" (Num. 31:16). As a result, "Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword" (Num. 31:8c).

NOTE: Many are the Balaams of the world—professional priests—students of religion—who fail to see the great difference between the idols of the world and the Lord Jehovah. The opportunities are there in the gracious revelation of God in Holy Scriptures, but in willful disregard they turn their backs on the gracious invitation extended by the Lord.

Prophecy number 1: Numbers 23:5-12

Remember, these are words given by God to the lips of Balaam for the ears of Balak—words of instruction for a heathen king—words of instruction by a heathen priest. They were to hear and profit from them. But! These words spoken in the privacy of the "high places of Baal" (Num. 22:41) were given by God also to the pen of Moses for the benefit of God's people of all times. We are to be aware of God's advice to the enemies of God's children and to the relationship between them as established by God's decree.

Balak wanted Israel brought down by a curse from a heathen priest; supernatural powers should accomplish what he could not! Put Israel under a spell and thus bring to nought what the God of Abraham intended for them!

Then comes the clear statement from the Lord God: God's promises, God's blessings cannot be revoked or be done away with. These people are one of a kind (23:9); rather than be destroyed they will increase (23:10a); happy is the man who is a part of these people, for not only are they protected in time, but also guided safely into a promised land after death (23:10b).

How rich the prophecy is for sermon or Bible class consideration! One might take the words, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his," as a sermon theme. You could support that theme with the thoughts: for that death comes after a life lived under God's protecting blessing; for that death ushers in an eternity of greater blessing. Of course, that underlying cause—reason for both temporal and spiritual blessings—was and is the Savior. Consider how God protected Israel until the coming of the promised Messiah. Israel's history is totally tied up in the God-given purpose of bringing forth the promised Seed—Jesus. The examples of the Lord's protecting Abraham's seed from the hatred and curses of those who hated them are endless. God's people of all times rest secure in time under the protection of the Lord Jesus' wings! After death ". . . it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we

shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). After death, an abiding city, "For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11:10).

Or one could approach the prophecy from the point of view of: The gates of hell shall not prevail against God's Church. Indeed, it tries to bring the Church to nought even in the face of clear prophecy to the contrary: "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed." Indeed, it tries to destroy the Church, but it is dealing with a "different" nation (23:9); indeed, it tries to bring the Church to nought, but eternity will reveal the triumphant Church in all its glory (23:10b).

An after thought:

How different the situation is with modern Israel in its attempt to regain the land of Abraham! No longer does it stand under the words God put on the lips of Balaam. The Lord's promise to the Old Testament Israel centered in and on the Messiah to come. When He came in the person of Jesus of Nazareth and was rejected by "His own" (John 1:11), Israel according to the flesh stood and stands with Balak and Balaam and no longer as "the dust of Jacob" or "the fourth part of Israel" (Num. 23:10a).

(To be continued)

Book Reviews

Luther the Reformer: The Story of the Man and His Career, by James Kittleson. Minneapolis: Augsburg. Cloth. 320 pp. \$24.95.

In the preface of this new biography the aim of the biographer is given: "The primary purpose of this book is to tell the story of Martin Luther to readers who are not specialists in the field of Luther studies and who have no desire to become ensnared in the arguments of specialists. It seeks to pluck the fruit of scholarly discussion for the benefit of general readers." It is claimed that other biographies, such as, Roland Bainton's *Here I Stand* and John Todd's *Luther: A Life*, were not complete as to the life of Luther. The latter author is an English Catholic scholar. When we first read Todd's book, we made a notation on the opening page, not knowing anything about the man: "No real understanding of sin and grace and then puts himself up as a judge of the thoughts and the mind of Martin Luther." Whether Kittleson accomplished his aim will naturally be up to the perception of the individual reader.

The author definitely has a very different approach to the writing of a biography. He approaches it with the history of the time and especially the intimate economic and personal life of the people of that time. He then fits it into the facts of the life of Martin Luther. He takes it a step further in that, as often as possible, he meshes in the words of Martin Luther himself—from his writings and from his table talks. In this way he makes many thoughts and actions real and understandable. When speaking of Luther's difficulties with the "faith" as taught in his day, he enters into the teachings and practices of the time with examples and quotations. In many cases this does give a very understandable picture of what was going on in the mind and heart of Luther as he entered the monastery and went through his most difficult years of development. Some biographers, for example, belittle the idea of youths' singing in the streets for their meals. When Kittleson is finished with this portion of Luther's life, you feel he did much singing in the streets and that it was a common thing.

Some quotations will give us a taste of the author's interesting style. When Luther finally went to the University of Erfurt, he was assigned to a "bursa." The author writes:

The bursa was nothing like a modern dormitory, but had far more the character of a monastery. All the students dressed alike and lived by the very strict rules of the bursa and the university. They arose at the same time, began every day with worship and prayer, ate their meals together, participated in other prescribed religious services together, and studied the same subjects. (44)

In pointing out that there was nothing different or odd about the young Luther, the author states:

If there had been something odd about Luther, some streak of earnestness, melancholy, or rebellion, surely a classmate would later have recorded it. None did so. The only such assertions came from the pens of his most violent enemies, such as Johannes Cochlaeus, who fabricated stories about Luther's early years even though they had met only once, in 1521. The young Luther appears to have been just another fun-loving and high-spirited student, certainly more brilliant than many of his classmates, but in other respects much like them. (44)

Concerning Luther's life in the monastery, the author writes: "Much later Luther commented, 'Along with many others, I myself have experienced how peaceful and quiet Satan is inclined to be during one's early years as a monk.'" Every minute was closely regulated. Luther and his fellows commonly awoke early in the morning, about 2:00 a.m., for the first worship service of the day. Six more followed. A novice had no time for those dark nights of the soul for which Luther later became famous.

All the monks were technically religious beggars, so it is entirely possible—especially as a novice—that Luther and the others saw some of the outside world as they begged for alms to support themselves. Financially, it was not really necessary for them to do so. The work was, however, good discipline. Still, most of Luther's time was spent in worship, prayer, and meditation. He did not beg alone and he did not work out his spiritual exercises alone. From the very beginning, he was assigned a proctor who would guide, measure and encourage his spiritual progress. Luther was learning a new and demanding routine. Given the sort of young man he was, he likely learned it quickly and well. (53)

[Later:] There was, however, one part of his vocation that Luther came to despise: confession. Confession (and the acts of penance that followed) was absolutely essential to monastic life. It occurred daily or even more frequently. In this sacrament, the "religious," as monks and nuns were called, sought to purge themselves of their sins almost as quickly as they committed them. Doing so was part of their pursuit of holiness. (55)

Kittleston does not spend a great amount of time on Luther in Rome and all that must have met him there; yet, he covers the subject completely. He does not go into the detail that some writers do as to his coming to Wittenberg the first time and all the developments that took place; however, he does cover the field. He often gives the reader a special insight into the school, the living quarters, and the studies, that one did not previously hold. And, above all, he does lead one to the inevitable point of when Luther's convictions were directed by the Bible as the one and only Word of Truth.

However, there is an irritating phrase that is continually added in the biography. Kittleston continually uses the phrase: "according to his understanding of the gospel . . . so committed was he to his understanding . . . according to his understanding or belief," etc. At first it appears that he is just presenting it and perhaps leaving it up to each reader to decide for himself or herself; but, as it continues and grows ever stronger, it sounds more as though the author is trying to present Luther as a stubborn man who just was not satisfied unless he had his way. And he wanted it completely or nothing. The true picture that he is not fully bringing out is that, as the "defender of the faith," Luther was very jealous for the saving truth of God and that he was very much afraid of Satan's attacks—that Satan might destroy the message the Lord had restored to his people and himself. This was evidently also the reason for the strong language that crept into his writing as well as the tenacity with which he fought anything contrary to that saving Word of Truth. He even saw the serious weaknesses that crept in among his fellow-professors.

The change in the faith and understanding of Luther in the crucial early years is often brought out well, however, in words such as these:

Even the key word "peace" received a new meaning from Luther's rereading of the righteousness of God. No longer was it the tranquillity and passivity of the soul that he had been taught to seek. By contrast, he insisted that "the royal way and the way of peace in the spirit is to know one's sin and to hate it and thus to fall into the fear of God lest he count it and permit it to dominate, and at the same time to pray for his mercy, that he would free us from it and not impute it." For Luther, those who had genuine peace were constantly striving, but they were secure only in the twofold conviction that they would never

succeed and that God had already granted them grace. (98)

When speaking of Luther's early debates and his writings, the author makes a point: "In these words a sharp-eyed reader could see an end not only to indulgences, but also to pilgrimages, special masses of the dead, shrines, images, relics, special spiritual exercises and much that was central to the practice of late medieval religion. Luther had undercut the very foundation of these practices."

The author writes of Cajetan's attempt to speak to Luther in a fatherly way, yet with great power and authority, asking for him to consider recanting:

The reality of the situation—and its real danger—at last crashed in on Luther. So that he would not be hindered if he were forced to flee for his life, Staupitz secretly released him from his vows of obedience as an Augustinian monk. Then Staupitz and Linck quietly stole out of the city by night. . . . Just a few months earlier he had left Heidelberg in triumph. Now he left Augsburg a fugitive. On the night of October 20, 1518, Lutheran. Without a dagger every prudent man carried for protection against robbers, without any means of defense, without spurs, and having left his undergarments behind, he was snuck through a hole in the city walls, mounted on an old nag, and carried miles out of the city. When he finally dismounted, he could hardly walk. (125)

The author points out that, as Luther approached his famous Leipzig debate, Luther and men like him had well-placed and influential defenders. In Nuremberg, Luther's old friend, Linck, served just such a group that included Albrecht Durer, the artist; Lazarus Spengler, the city secretary; Willibald Pirckheimer, a patrician member of the government; and Christoph Scheurl, the city attorney. They, no doubt, were the group that translated the ninety-five theses into German so quickly. Some of these men signaled Luther to keep silent at certain times for his own political good. But men like Eck made it too much to bear. The author then writes:

For Luther, this was too much. In mid-January, before even seeing Eck's theses, he had been asked to comment on the new papal decree regarding indulgences. There he said that "it does not allege a single word from the Scriptures, neither of the teachers (of the church) nor of church law nor of reason" as support; therefore, it was "just empty words" that "I am unable to acknowledge as proper and sufficient teachings of the holy church. I must hold to the commandments of God." (137)

How often this has happened today in the statements of the present pope and other religious leaders—no Scripture.

We often do not realize that these debates were "grand" affairs. Note:

It opened on June 27 with a high mass and a great banquet. On the debate's first day Pope Leo lost one battle: Charles I of Spain was unanimously elected Holy Roman Emperor. But for those gathered in Leipzig, the main event was occurring in the central hall of Castle Pleissenburg. Sixty-five armed men from Leipzig stood watch to make certain that no one disturbed the debators. The 200 students from Wittenberg were somewhere in the town, although they left when they ran out of money. Additional supporters had come to Luther's side from Erfurt and Zwickau, and the whole theological faculty from Leipzig was present to support Eck. A Leipzig humanist, Peter Mosellanus, formally opened the proceedings with an oration of several hours. The debate lasted ten days. (139)

Mosellanus, mentioned by the author here, later sent out a glowing description of Martin Luther, his appearance, and abilities.

The author, James Kittleson, gives a certain amount of space to the last years of the life of Luther, and he ends by saying that justice has often been neglected when it comes to these years. However, the author himself misses the important point of those latter years in that he does not give a real picture of the "building of the Church" (the Evangelical) and all the real problems Luther faced in the local fields. He deals only with a few brief difficulties that Luther had in that development with incompetent pastors who were former priests. Here it was that people had to be taught to put out these leaders, and in the shortage Luther

had to train men as temporary pastors and teachers. Nor is one of the main tasks of Luther in this case ever mentioned: How Luther had to write and print out his "book of sermons" so these men could read them to the people or memorize them and preach them as their own. Little discussion is given to the importance of the Large and Small Catechism in this work. He also does not bring in fully the importance of the work of hymn-writing and congregational singing. It is not that they are not mentioned, but that they are not given their importance in the picture. In fact, the home and family and how it was slowly brought back by Luther—how his own family life as a married man was such an example to many people—how many regularly visited and stayed at Luther's place sometimes for months and longer and were affected by his home and family and how much this did for the common people—all this is touched on very lightly. In this part of the life of Luther, the author does not give one a full picture of the physical blessings the man received through the home and family. For example, he mentions the property Luther and Katie purchased at one time, but he does not bring in the connection with Katie's family through which they knew and bought the piece of land.

The biography is a good one, but many things were omitted that made Luther a "whole man," as Kittleson calls him. It is a book that could be handed out to one who wants a fairly complete study but is not particularly interested in a full story on some of the important issues of Luther's later life.

Ralph Schaller

Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation , by James Davison Hunter. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1987. Hard-cover. 302 pp.

In the years from 1981 to 1985 a survey was made of the views of students in selected Evangelical colleges and seminaries as well as the views of the faculties of the same selected colleges. The purpose of the survey was to determine whether the Evangelical leaders of the future have the same views as their predecessors or whether a change of viewpoint is to be expected in the near future when these present-day students attain leadership roles in the Church.

The colleges chosen for the survey were the following: Wheaton College, Gordon College, Westmont College, Bethel College, Houghton College, Seattle-Pacific University, George Fox College, Taylor University, and Messiah College. These colleges have reputations as being academically strong and religiously conservative. Seven seminaries were selected for the survey: Fuller Theological Seminary, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Asbury Theological Seminary, Talbot Theological Seminary, Westminster Theological Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, and Wheaton Graduate School.

James Davison Hunter, assistant professor of sociology at the University of Virginia, has used the results of this survey to project what Evangelicalism will be like twenty years or so down the road. His prognosis is not reassuring.

Chapter Two is entitled "Theology: The Shifting Meaning of Faith." Professor Hunter sees a noticeable difference between the previously accepted Evangelical understanding of the Bible as the inerrant Word of God and the prevalent view of the coming generation that the Bible "is not always to be taken literally in its statements concerning matters of science, historical reporting, etc." The old view was that the Bible, although not a history or science textbook, "does not err when it makes statements of historical or scientific fact." This, of course, is also our Evangelical Lutheran confession, as summarized in the Brief Statement of 1932 . Only a minority of the present students of the selected conservative colleges and seminaries accept this old view. Thus the direction is away from inerrancy and absolute truth towards subjectivism and relativity.

What the coming generation of Evangelicals believes about the origin of the world is even more discouraging. Only 28% of the college students, and only 29% of the semi nary students opted for the view that "the world was created in six twenty-four hour days." The view that Genesis 1-11 is a symbolic or poetic account rather than a historical account has apparently won the day.

Even more depressing is the fact that the college students tend to become less orthodox in their years at Evangelical colleges. In other words, the college freshmen are much more likely to accept a six-day creation than college seniors. The reason for this becomes obvious when we take into account the survey's tabulation of the views of the college faculties. On the issues of inerrancy and salvation by faith in Christ alone the views of the college teachers were more unbiblical than their students. Professor Hunter states it well: "Faculty overall are even less committed to the theological and cultural traditions of the Evangelical heritage than their students. It is difficult to imagine this fact not having a profound effect on the world view of students" (175). Parents send their young people to Evangelical colleges to have their commitment to Christ and His Word strengthened, but what happens so often is that faith is weakened and even destroyed. If this is true even of Evangelical colleges, how much more must it be true of the liberal colleges and seminaries of the mainline denominations!

Our church body operates and supports only one college and one seminary: Immanuel Lutheran College and Seminary in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. We know that in the next ten years many present faculty members will no longer be teaching in our school because of advanced age. How important it is, therefore, for us already now to pray to our gracious God to provide for us orthodox and able teachers in our college and seminary, that is, to guide our calling boards to call those persons as faculty members who are firmly committed to our confessional Lutheran heritage because they are convinced that it is in agreement with the Word of God. What great damage is done in the Church when college and seminary teachers imitate Satan by asking: "Has God indeed said?" (Gen. 3:1) and by thus creating doubts in the hearts of their students! It is not wrong to question our traditions and ways of doing things, if only the foundation of God's sure Word remains intact.

But listen to what Professor Hunter says:

Once the belief that the central facts (carried by the traditions and taught by churches) are facts in the most literal and absolute sense is weakened, traditional religion begins to disintegrate. The most important case in point is the place of Scriptures. When it is allowed, as it is increasingly so in Evangelicalism, to interpret the Bible subjectivistically and to see portions of the Scripture as symbolic or non-binding, the Scriptures are divested of their authority to compel obedience. They may still inspire but they are substantially disarmed. The same is true for codes of behavior and belief traditionally held to be biblically inspired. When they lose a sense of divine origin or divine sanction, or when they are seen as having a human and temporal origin, the believer's conviction is enfeebled. (184-185)

D. Lau

Unmasking the New Age , by Douglas R. Groothuis. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, © 1986, by Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of the USA. Paper. 192 pp. \$6.95. (Quotations by permission of publisher.)

If the New Age movement were only some recently formed religious cult, it would not be a matter of so much concern. It represents, however, a pervasive shift in the thinking of Western man—a shift which is making inroads into almost every area of human thought and activity.

The following are illustrations of the present impact of the New Age movement: advertisements on radio and television telling us that we are good and have unlimited potential; the advent of "New Age" sections in book stores; the growing popularity of Eastern meditative techniques to expand one's mental horizons and increase personal creativity; the use by corporations and governmental agencies of New Age growth seminars to increase the productivity and team spirit of executives and managers; the employment of pantheistic principles by medical personnel in some varieties of holistic healing techniques; the presence on best-seller lists of books by Shirley MacLaine; the growth of cults which involve mysticism and the occult,

such as the Ramtha ("the enlightened one") movement under J. Z. Knight; a fascination with Eastern religious ideas, such as reincarnation; the resurgence of goddess worship, witchcraft, shamanism, and other pagan practices; a reintroduction of the Gnostic heresy in Christianity; occasional reports of public school educators leading children in meditation and teaching them that they have within themselves the potential for universal wisdom and perfection; and the trend in modern physics to view the world as a single, interconnecting unity, which an observer cannot know objectively because his own actions have an effect on what he observes.

New Age thinking might be characterized as a mystical humanism. Secular humanism, with its exclusion of deity and divine revelation and its focus on human reason and scientific advancement, has been the prevailing world view in Western civilization. But the human spirit cannot long abide an atheistic philosophy of life that exalts naturalism and materialism and finds no ultimate purpose or value in this world and universe. It is perhaps for this reason that the New Age movement has been gaining so much momentum in recent years. It has taken the sterile, unsatisfying secular humanism and transformed it through the inclusion of mystical elements, particularly from Eastern religion and philosophy. It speaks of a oneness of all life and being, and it finds an element of divinity and an unlimited potential in each human existence—a reflection of the appealing temptation of Satan in the garden: "You will be like God" (Gen. 3:5), and of the paganism of the ancients, "who worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator" (Rom. 1:25).

Because of the growing influence of New Age thinking in our culture, it is important that Christian pastors and teachers acquaint themselves with this movement. The book, *Unmasking the New Age*, by Douglas R. Groothuis, can be of help in understanding what New Age thought is and how it is threatening to transform society. The author is a graduate student in philosophy and is presently serving as an instructor at the McKenzie Study Center in Eugene, Oregon. He approaches his subject from a Biblical viewpoint and repeatedly shows how the New Age movement poses a threat to Christian doctrine and faith.

In the first chapter Groothuis identifies what he regards as the six chief characteristics of New Age thinking: 1) the idea that all is one (monism); 2) the belief that all is God (pantheism); 3) the conviction that humanity is God, that we are not only perfect but are in fact gods; 4) the seeking of a change in consciousness so as to achieve a full unfolding of human potential; 5) an assertion that basically all religions are one (syncretism); and 6) an optimism that mankind can direct the course of cosmic evolution and thereby achieve a great transformation and a glorious future.

In the second chapter the author views the history of the New Age movement, showing how it has grown out of the counterculture of the 1960s; and in subsequent chapters he explores specific ways in which this world view is trying to enter our society: through the health industry, psychology, science, politics, and the new spirituality.

Here is a sample of Groothuis' writing. On the last of the above topics he says:

New Age spirituality comes in a variety of packages: from established Eastern religious groups to personal meditative practices, from occult rituals to a general belief in reincarnation. Beliefs considered exotic or bizarre twenty years ago have carved their way into the West's "plausibility structure." They are acceptable and even noncontroversial to many; and they are clearly antithetical to orthodox Christianity.

This new spirituality is not necessarily reducible to the classical Eastern religions (Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism and their offshoots). Rather, the injection of Eastern, neo-pagan and occult ideas into Western religious thought has produced a hybrid spirituality; it takes the essence of Eastern religions but retains some elements of the Western, Judeo-Christian world view. What results is a mutation. The One [monism] remains, but it is couched in certain Western sensibilities. . .

The West's and especially North America's concern with efficiency and immediate results has shaped this new spirituality. Because the modern lifestyle is characterized by quick and easy transitions in our pluralistic culture (changing churches, jobs, spouses or world views), commitment to a spiritual path must be streamlined and systematized. Although some may retreat to a Buddhist

monastery or join a New Age commune, the new spiritual practices and beliefs are often geared specifically for modern life. Maharishi Mahesh Yogi's transcendental meditation, for instance, is presented as an efficient science of consciousness: follow the prescription (meditate twice daily, twenty minutes each time) and watch the results. Est [Erhard Seminars Training] offered its graduates enlightenment after only two intensive weekend seminars.

. . . The New Age repudiates the world-denying or ascetic approach that characterizes much of Eastern mysticism. Instead it favors a world-affirming or even hedonistic lifestyle where "enlightenment" is fully compatible with worldly success. (131-132)

In a final chapter Groothuis presents useful summary material and offers suggestions as to how Christians can counter the New Age movement. The volume concludes with copious endnotes, suggestions for related reading, and an index.

Throughout the book the author manifests a high view of Scripture and an understanding of Law and Gospel. He encourages his readers to evaluate each aspect of the New Age movement by a comparison with the Bible, and he illustrates such evaluation through the use of well-chosen passages from Scripture. Although he feels strongly about the dangers of New Age thinking, he shows a spirit of moderation in not rejecting out of hand those aspects of the movement which are not wrong in themselves. As an illustration of this, he does not deny that certain practices associated with holistic health may be useful, such as, a nutritional approach to the prevention and cure of disease.

The author has surely put his finger on the central issue when he affirms that man's chief problem is, not a failure to recognize and utilize an alleged inner divinity and in finite potential, but rather his sin against the personal Creator God; and that man's salvation is to be gained, not through a change in consciousness to unite himself with "the all," but rather through faith in the redemption that has been brought by Christ Jesus.

This book cannot be regarded as easy reading, for the author does write as a philosopher, researcher, and educator. Yet with a little patience and a dictionary at hand, the reader can gain much valuable information about the New Age movement and its dangers to society and the church.

C. Kuehne

The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church , by Malachi Martin. New York: Linden Press, © 1987. Hard-cover. 525 pp. \$19.95.

If prominent theologian and former Jesuit Malachi Martin is correct in his analysis of the Roman Catholic church, profound changes have taken place in that body—changes involving many of the regular and secular clergy, both bishops and priests, and many of the laymembers; changes which have reduced this church to a "stumbling shambles of schism and heresy and defection" (500).

These changes have their roots, Martin believes, in the spirit of modernism which began engulfing the Western world in the 19th century and which has by now produced such fruits as secular humanism and atheism. Many Catholics have come to view traditional doctrines, including that of the hierarchy of the church and the infallibility of the pope, as outworn relics of a superstitious and undemocratic age. They have, moreover, come to believe that their church's chief mission on earth is, not to rescue men for eternity from sin and death through the ministration of the sacraments by the priesthood, but rather the sociopolitical liberation of the world's poor and oppressed. In this new "Liberation Theology" mankind's chief enemies are regarded as social abuses and political oppression, which are allegedly the result of economic capitalism; and "salvation" is to be sought through political action and Marxist socialization, including armed revolution when necessary.

Those who are promoting this theology find the true church, not in the papacy and hierarchy, but in the various groups of "God's people" throughout the earth. Such "base communities" are the ultimate source of truth, so that there is no longer an absolute need for association with the traditional church, its priesthood and sacraments. These new theologians hold to an optimistic belief in the innate goodness of man, as proclaimed by Rousseau and his followers; and they are pursuing a utopian goal of unlimited social progress leading to the ultimate perfection of the human condition here on earth. The old supernatural ideals and eternal considerations have given way largely to temporal strivings and material concerns.

It is ironic that one of the leading forces in Catholicism now undermining the authority of the papal hierarchy and promoting Liberation Theology is the Society of Jesus, which from its founding by Ignatius of Loyola in 1540 until the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) was the leading defender of the pope and of traditional doctrine and morals. The author pictures the Jesuits as betrayers of their church and its teachings, and as presently engaged in bitter warfare against papal power and tradition.

Vatican II is seen by Martin as a turning point in Catholicism. While its decrees did uphold papal prerogatives and the ancient beliefs, they contained also certain vague expressions of needed change, which liberals have used—the author would say "distorted"—so as to justify their new theology and sociopolitical activism. The "spirit of Vatican II" has become the excuse for a "renewal" in the church which has overthrown the old moorings and has set off in a new humanistic direction.

Martin cherishes little hope for the future of the Society of Jesus in Roman Catholicism, but he does retain the confidence of a true Catholic that the papacy will continue perpetually.

This well-researched book can help us understand more fully the innovations and tensions which have become evident in the Roman Catholic church since Vatican II. It explains also why many modern-day bishops and priests have to a greater or lesser extent forsaken their spiritual duties and have become involved in a wide variety of political and social actions, including the promotion of Marxism in such countries as Nicaragua.

The book demonstrates also the dangers inherent in a pursuit of academic excellence. When that pursuit, as in the case of the Jesuits, aims at recognition among the world's intelligentsia, its fruits can easily come to include fleshly pride and a rejection of old beliefs.

The Lutheran reader of *The Jesuits* is bound to wonder: Will the papacy ultimately prevail in its war against the modernist forces which have taken over a large segment of its church and are threatening its position of supreme authority? Over the centuries popes have shown themselves remarkably capable of adapting to new circumstances and maintaining their assumed prerogatives, and they will no doubt find an effective response over against their modern-day opponents; for according to Scripture this "man of sin" will be destroyed, not by Liberation Theology, but by the Lord Jesus Christ with the brightness of His coming on Judgment Day.

C. Kuehne