

The Endeavour

Magazine

A CHRISTIAN BELPHIAN REVIEW

TWO SHILLINGS

In This Issue

Page 2

LIFE AND TIMES OF
JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

Page 4

YOUR QUESTIONS
ANSWERED

Page 6

AN IMPORTANT NEW
MONUMENT FROM
ASSYRIA

Page 8

WERE YOU THERE?

Page 11

GREATER THINGS

Page 13

REVIEWS

Page 14

A TIME FOR
ACTION

Page 16

CHILDREN'S HOME

No. 31

Spring 1969

SUBSTITUTIONS

"SUPPRESS nature and it recurs." This principle has been enunciated by students of human nature in many connections and in differing terms, and those who ignore it do so at their peril. The basic urges of human nature, that of self-preservation for example, are so spontaneous and deep-seated that complete eradication is almost impossible. They may be inhibited in one direction, only to assert themselves in another. Through the ages governments have been trying to achieve public good by their laws and policies. Thinkers have analysed what is wrong with the human society they knew, and have prescribed the cure. Statesmen have expended much toil on the formulation of sound policies, and lawyers have tried to formulate just laws to put these ideals into practice. How rarely is the desired end achieved. How often the ugly head of human pride and sin re-asserts itself just as it seemed to have been cut off.

Those who try to discipline themselves are in the same sort of position. It is one thing to acknowledge the ideal, it is another to achieve it. For religious people generally the danger of hypocrisy is particularly close, a profession of standards discreetly (and perhaps unconsciously) flouted in daily living. For small religious communities there is a special danger, which is apparent from other small groups and communities. A small nation bordering on a large, powerful one is liable to manifest a quite absurd chauvinism. Its own exaggerated virtues are regularly contrasted with the equally exaggerated vices held to prevail across the border. A small political party will often have qualities and an importance in its own estimation which no impartial observer would ever detect. Membership of small bodies impels people to justify themselves in the face of more powerful and influential organisations. In some aspects this may be to the good. It may create a feeling that the member is a personal

(Please turn to back page)

The Life and Times of John Thomas M.D.

4. The Reluctant Orator

by Brian Tighe

On hearing next day of the doctor's baptism, he was full of wrath and indignation, considering it a reflection on his own ministerialism, and a lamentable act of folly in the doctor to be immersed by people who were regarded as heretics. His anger was very hot. It was something he could not forgive, and from that day to his death (which occurred in April of the present year) the entente cordiale was never perfectly restored.

IN THIS WAY *The Ambassador* for 1864 described the effect of John Thomas's conversion to Campbellism on his father. The account did not point out, however, that his father joined the Campbellite body himself in later years. His impetuosity, which had led the family up and down Britain and ultimately to America was now manifested in his oscillation between the two countries and further changes in his religious allegiances.

Dr Thomas himself spent the next seven months in Cincinnati staying with Major Ganow. It was the most peaceful period of his life in America. At the end of that period, in April 1833, he decided to return to the East Coast carrying with him two letters of introduction. One was addressed to Dr Richardson of Wellsburgh, Virginia, and the other to Alexander Campbell of Bethany. An interesting reference is found at this point to another member of the Thomas household, one of John's brothers who was, apparently, a compositor in Alexander Campbell's printing office. This, it seems, was one of the main reasons for the journey.

Dr Thomas was met in Wellsburgh by Dr Richardson and it was not long before he was introduced to Alexander Campbell, who happened to be visiting Wellsburgh. The latter (described by John Thomas as "a shabbily dressed farm-labourer-looking man in an old drab coat and slouching white hat") invited him to stay for a while at his home in Bethany. Dr Thomas commented later, "His establishment comprised a post office, a printing office, a store, a mill, and a stone meeting house besides his residence. But notwithstanding the opulence of his circumstances, Mr Campbell lived in a very plain unostentatious style." The relationship between John Thomas and Alexander Campbell became more and more complex as time went by. Of their initial encounter John Thomas wrote that he found him to be "a very pleasant and agreeable companion." Notwithstanding this, it is clear that he manipulated John Thomas into situations in a way which makes one wonder at the latter's naiveté. Within two years they were to become (in print) bitter enemies and yet such was their basic compatibility that John Thomas, commenting on a debate held at the height of their animosity, wrote:—

Nevertheless, we can both appeal with confidence to the candour of our brethren and the public to say if they ever witnessed a debate, between two who had been years in opposition, conducted with such propriety, equanimity, and good humour.

It was Alexander Campbell who started John Thomas on his speaking career and by subsequent "letters of introduction" to a few well-chosen Campbellite strongholds, ensured that he could not abandon it. The account of the process in *The Ambassador* is largely as John Thomas told it. Although reported in the third person the wry humour of Dr Thomas, recalling how he was "manipulated" is still discernible: it would be a pity to omit it.

On a certain Sunday, shortly after the doctor's arrival at Bethany, he went with Mr Campbell to Wellsburgh, where the latter had a preaching appointment. On the way to the meeting in the afternoon, Mr Campbell (who had spoken in the morning) said to the doctor that he should call upon him to speak that afternoon. The doctor told him he must not by any means do so, as he had never spoken in public on religious matters in his life, and he should have nothing to say if he did get up. Mr Campbell replied that that did not matter; he should certainly call on him, for he liked to see what sort of mettle a man was made of. This was said with so decided an air that the doctor saw there was no escape and remarked to Mr Campbell that if he did intend to call on him, he (Mr Campbell) must occupy the time as long as he could so as to give him a little chance of preparation. Having

arrived at the meeting house, the doctor took up his Bible while sitting in his seat and began to turn it over in search of something as a foundation for remark. He went from one end to the other without being able to fix upon anything, when at last it occurred to him that he knew more about Daniel's four empires than the generality of people (knowing only Rollins' interpretation) and that the second chapter which treats of them, being a long one, the reading of it would give him time to accustom himself (before commencing to speak) to standing head and shoulders above the people. The doctor was called upon in due course and proceeded with the reading of the chapter. Having got through it, he fixed his eyes upon the doorpost and delivered himself of all he knew upon the subject without venturing to look his audience in the face. Having occupied about half an hour, in which time he completely emptied himself, he concluded with a sudden stop and sat down. He was astonished to hear afterwards that the people were taken with his discourse.

Alexander Campbell continued his process of seeing what sort of mettle John Thomas was made of the following Sunday. As they were walking to the meeting house at Bethany in the morning he announced his intention of calling upon John Thomas to speak in the afternoon. The latter, thinking that there would be an hour or two to prepare, did not object strongly. Alexander Campbell had another surprise for him however:—

Mr Campbell occupied from half past ten till two, and then concluded the meeting with the remark that they would have a recess for a quarter of an hour, after which Dr Thomas would speak to them. The doctor had calculated upon a considerable interval between the morning and afternoon meeting and was taken aback at finding that he had only a quarter of an hour to prepare. He had considerable difficulty in fixing his mind upon anything to say, but at last

decided to speak on the apostasy, of which he had read something. He occupied the afternoon with this subject, speaking, as afterwards transpired, to the satisfaction of those who heard; the meeting over he concluded that he had better get out of the way as fast as he could.

Dr Thomas decided to leave at once and travel to Baltimore by way of Washington in Pennsylvania. He indicated his wish to Alexander Campbell and this initiated a sequence of events which illustrate his under-estimation of Alexander Campbell's determination. By letters of introduction which he gave to John Thomas and sent ahead of him to Campbellites in the various cities which the latter proposed to visit, Alexander Campbell made sure that John Thomas was welcomed as a speaker of considerable ability wherever he went. We take up the account in *The Ambassador* as John Thomas set out on his journey from Bethany after a stay of about four weeks.

After a ride of considerable length during which his eyes were inflamed by the glare of the sunlight from the macadamised road, the doctor arrived at Somerset Courthouse just as the friends of Mr Campbell were about to hold a meeting. Having heard of him, they expressed themselves very glad to see him and assumed that he would speak to them that evening. He told them that this was impossible from the state of his eyes. His apology was accepted, but they insisted on making arrangements for him to speak in the courthouse on the following Sunday. This was the result of Campbell's letter of introduction . . . he allowed himself to be posted for a special public discourse which he had never attempted on any previous instance. Sunday arrived, and a large audience assembled in the courthouse and the doctor gave his discourse which occupied two hours . . . during the 16 days he remained among them they had him 10 times upon his legs. . . . He made up his mind to carry out his object by at once pushing on to Baltimore where, he was informed, the most intelligent congregation of the

Reformationists was situated, and where, therefore, he presumed they would be able to do all the speaking for themselves and leave him to attend to his medical duties. He arrived there on Sunday evening, and to his dismay (his approach having been signified by the Pennsylvania Campbellites) he was at once solicited to address the congregation. He wished to decline the engagement, but they would take no denial: and he spoke. Having heard him, nothing would satisfy them short of taking the public hall (Scottis' Hall) and calling the public together to hear the new preacher. The hall was engaged for a week, and every night in the week the doctor addressed the public on "The Ancient Faith." . . . At the end of his appointments, the doctor determined to break away from the speaking career which was being forced upon him and told his Baltimore friends he must be off to see Philadelphia before going to Richmond. . . .

On arriving at Philadelphia, he found Deacon Hazlett who expressed great satisfaction at his having come, saying they wanted someone to speak to them and to relieve the tediousness of their meetings. This was by no means a welcome intimation to the doctor whose desire was to leave the field of theological controversy and retire into the quietness and privacy of individual study. However he felt he could do nothing less, as a sort of return for their hospitality, than yield to their request and speak to them. This he did for three weeks. At the end of that time they proposed that he should remain among them altogether, promising that they would do their best to get him practice. . . . The doctor finally concluded to stay.

Dr Thomas stayed for 11 months in Philadelphia (July 1833-June 1834). In that time several notable events took place. First, and perhaps least important, his father (coincidentally it seems) took up a position as Baptist

minister in Philadelphia. He had in the meantime visited England for a few weeks. He returned there again not 12 months later. On 1st January 1834 Dr Thomas (to use his own words) "committed the great foolishness of getting married." Robert Roberts tactfully suggested that the statement "must to some extent be regarded as ironical," but in spite of this one feels that the two parties most concerned in the matter must have felt the truth of it from time to time. It would be impertinent to suggest that John Thomas's decision to marry was an impetuous one. It certainly shows him as a man of decision for he had, apparently, only met his future wife some five or six months before their marriage. His life developed in such a way that the lot of his wife was a difficult one, aggravated by the fact that she seems to have been something of an invalid. In spite of this she outlived her husband and it was, in fact, shortly after his death that she said of him, "The doctor belonged to the public and was not much of a woman's man." There was one child by the marriage, a daughter, Eusebia. She seems to have been devoted to her father and accompanied him on several of his later journeys.

A third development, which must be marked as significant, was the beginning of Dr Thomas's editorial career. It began quite by chance, as the result of a shrewd sales scheme devised by a man named Brindley, who had been a shipbuilder in England, but was at that time an agent for Morrison's pills. "Conceiving the idea of making Campbellism subservient to a more extended circulation of his nostrums, he went to Mr Ballantyne, the pastor, and suggested that a paper should be started to advocate the principles of the Reformation, intending, as afterwards transpired, to have an advertisement of his pills on the back of every number." He put the same suggestion to Dr Thomas, suggesting that he might draft a prospectus for the magazine, but omitting to mention "the quackery part of the project" or the fact that he had suggested the same idea to Ballantyne. Brindley, who obviously hoped to get the scheme under way more quickly by involving the two men, arranged a meeting to discuss the matter. Neither

Ballantyne nor Dr Thomas knew that the other was involved in the project; Ballantyne until he saw the prospectus and Dr Thomas until Ballantyne turned up at the meeting "with a lowering and indignant countenance." Worse was yet to come, for Ballantyne, refusing a glass of ale "in a very surly manner," announced that he would not edit a periodical in conjunction with Alexander Campbell himself, railed at John Thomas for having written the prospectus and "departed in great anger." John Thomas in the detached manner of a medical practitioner commented: "His natural moroseness of temper and countenance had been aggravated by an attack of jaundice!"

As events transpired a peaceable solution was reached within a week or so. Brindley withdrew from the scene very rapidly and Ballantyne, deciding that he was too old for such an undertaking, encouraged Dr Thomas to proceed as editor. The magazine, entitled *The Apostolic Advocate*, was first produced in May 1834. It carried the recommendation of Alexander Campbell (through publicity in his own periodical *The Millennial Harbinger*) and largely for this reason the 1,000 copies printed of the first number were all sold. The Campbellites in Philadelphia were noticeably cool towards the project and, largely for this reason, John Thomas decided to move to "a more genial latitude in the south." When he announced his intention of moving to Richmond the coolness in Philadelphia became decidedly wintry with the result that the Thomas household moved for a few weeks to Baltimore (where the next issue of *The Advocate* was published), and finally to Richmond in July 1834.

On arrival in Richmond John Thomas found that Alexander Campbell had written to the Campbellites there, some 12 months previously, ensuring that his arrival would not go unnoticed. He eventually agreed to settle there, preaching to the Campbellite community, whilst entering into medical practice in Richmond for his own support. The arrangement worked quite smoothly and peaceably until September 1834; in that month the fifth number of *The Apostolic Advocate* appeared. The effect was quite startling.

A Reader writes:

I read Brother McHaffie's article on "Christ and War" in the last issue with real edification, but some problems stick in my mind which he did not deal with. I am sure he could say something useful on them, and no doubt others of your readers have been struck by the same things. First, it is easy of course to quote the gospel that "God is love," but what about the other statements in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, which present God as a man of war? The New Testament repeats that "vengeance is mine." How are the differing statements to be reconciled? Secondly, it is surely not so simple as to say that we should not resist evil. Do we not all "resist evil" so far as our property is concerned? We make our homes secure before going away and take out insurance policies to cover us against possible burglary. I understand that thereby we permit the company to take legal action in our name to bring to justice those who may have stolen or damaged our property. Is this permissible? Or to take another point, suppose we knew of a person living richly on the proceeds of crime, and one who brushed aside all the personal reproaches that we had tried to address to him. Should we not have to balance our love for society in general, which this man was regularly defrauding, with our concern for his own personal salvation? Might it not be the most Christian thing to inform against him? But to do so would surely be resisting evil?

Brother McHaffie replies:

The object of the article "Jesus and War" was to explore the reasons why Jesus taught as He did, particularly in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus did not so much lay down laws as such but gave examples to explain basic principles. One can obey a law blindly, but to apply a principle it is necessary to understand.

I suggested that the reason behind Jesus' teaching on personal relations and war was to be found in the motive of reconciliation. To be true to this motive one must have a regard for the person and personality of the aggressor. The aim should be to act magnanimously in his best interests

Your Questions Answered

Jesus and War

with the ultimate aim of his reconciliation to God. An aggressor may be beside himself through grief or greed or jealousy and be about to commit an act which, in his better moments, he would bitterly regret. For a Christian to feel bound in such circumstances not to use force in physical restraint is to misinterpret the situation in which Jesus visualised turning the other cheek.

In the matter of a thief it is clearly not to his advantage that his trade should be made easier and more tempting and he become more deeply involved in crime. Progressive treatment of criminals, such as open prisons, comes in for criticism but at least it is an attempt to understand the person of the criminal and rehabilitate him to honest society rather than merely devising punishment to fit the crime. Before a criminal can be truly at peace again with his fellows and with his God, he must make a confession of his guilt and accept the judicial consequences. To act otherwise would put him in danger of the psychosomatic illness described in Psalm 32: 3-4 (RSV):

When I declared not my sin, my
body wasted away
through my groaning all day long.
For day and night thy hand was
heavy upon me;
my strength was dried up as by
the heat of summer.

In this state of mind one is beyond hope of peace or reconciliation to God. If therefore we would have regard for our neighbour's spiritual

health, we will not indifferently pass by while he commits crimes. At this point there are spiritual pitfalls. Some people like snooping out faults and broadcasting them. As a by-product this may bring some crime to light, but as the motive is not the spiritual good of the criminal no reconciliation or peace can result. Others do not care what crimes their fellows commit. Such people are at the ultimate of tolerance and permissiveness even if they adopt rigorous standards for themselves. Thus vandals can wreck public or private property but bystanders make no effort to inform the police or warn the owners. This indifference shows no respect for the spiritual health of the vandals who are encouraged to more indiscipline and worse crime. Public censure is a valuable disciplinary force. That someone cares, is more so.

The commandment to "resist not evil" is given that quarrels may be patched up. Bitterness on both sides can lead at least only to an expedient peace, not a real friendship. Only if one party is prepared to move, possibly at cost to themselves, can animosity be broken and a real bond be established. Therefore "resist not evil", take the insult, absorb the aggression and so destroy it.

With regard to the crisis attendant on the establishment of the Kingdom of God, I think we must hesitate to quote texts from the Old Testament as though Jesus had never spoken in the New. Jesus did, after all, say in quoting the moral position of the Old Testament, "You have heard that it

was said . . . But I say to you . . ." (Matt. 5: 21) "Moses allowed you to . . . And I say . . ." (Matt. 19: 8). These utterances do not mark change simply for change's sake but enshrine a higher moral principle.

It would be a sorry thing if the most beneficent, just, honourable and humane rule the world has ever known could only be introduced by methods which have disgraced governments in the past. If it could only be maintained by blood-red suppression and instant capital punishment for any who complain, after the manner of the Caesars, the Stalinists or perhaps the Greek Colonels, what would the ordinary person think?

Paul says, "The weapons of our warfare are not worldly but have divine power to destroy strongholds" (II Corinthians 10: 4). We can pull down a castle by ramming its walls, terrorising and killing its inhabitants and defenders, women, children and men. This will lead to a peace of a kind on the place. It will be hailed as a great victory and go down in the annals of the conqueror in song and story. How much better, though, to befriend the inhabitants, break down the personal enmities and leave the place humming with the arts of peace! This is a far greater victory with a weapon greater than any sword and mightier to destroy strongholds. "For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit . . ." (Hebrews 4: 12). "From his mouth issues a sharp sword" (Revelation 19: 15). From the lips of Jesus leaps the Word of God. The Word of God creates. It is like a fire and like a hammer which breaks the rock in pieces (Jeremiah 23: 29).

On the lips of Jesus the Word can still the storm on the sea, and the waves which roar among men can be stilled by the words from Jesus' mouth. We must not minimise this divine power to destroy strongholds and imagine that God needs carnal iron, steel, tanks, bombs or bacteria. Jesus' Kingdom is not a worldly one taking its standards from men's ways.

My kingship is not of this world; if my kingship were of this world, my servants would fight, that I might not be handed over to the Jews; but my kingship is not from this world

(John 18: 36).

An Important New Monument from Assyria

By Wilfred Lambert

NOT MANY BIBLICAL personages are mentioned in contemporary secular documents. For example, of the 42 kings of Israel and Judah only eight are certainly named in other documents, namely Ahab, Jehu, Menahem, Ahaz, Hoshea, Hezekiah, Menasseh and Jehoiachin. It is, then, an exceptional find which brings to light a mention of another king, and that is what has happened over the last two years.

The British School of Archaeology in Iraq has been digging for the last few seasons at a small Assyrian site, Tell al Rimah, between the River Tigris and the Habur, a tributary of the Euphrates, due west of the main Assyrian cities. In spring, 1967, a stele was found a little over four feet high and beautifully carved with the figure of the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III in relief. Eight divine symbols occur around his head and a 21-line inscription was carved over the lower portion of the stele, from side to side and so right over the lower part of the king's body. However, the last nine lines have been chiselled away, though traces remain from which most of the signs can be made out. The School authorised the epigraphist of the expedition, Miss Stephanie Page, to publish this stele forthwith, and it appeared in the autumn, 1968, number of the journal *Iraq*. The speedy publication is most welcome, but the translation given cannot be sustained in a number of points, some important for the historical significance, so a new rendering of the perfectly preserved first twelve lines, which happen to be those of particular Biblical interest, is given here:

To Adad, the great lord, the aristocrat of the gods, the warrior, the son of Anu, the resplendent, the famous, the exalted, canal supervisor of heaven and earth, who rains down abundance, who resides in Zamahu, the great lord, his lord:—

Adad-nirari, the mighty king, king of the universe, king of Assyria, son of Shamshi-Adad, king of the universe, king of Assyria, son of Shalmaneser, king of the four quarters (of the world):—

I called up chariots, troops and camp and gave the order to march to the Hittite land. Within one year I made the whole of the Amorite and Hittite land bow down to my feet. I imposed tribute and tax on them for the rest of time. I received 2,000 talents of silver, 1,000 talents of bronze, 2,000 talents of iron, 3,000 multicoloured garments and linen garments as the tax of Mari' of Damascus. I received the tax of Joash (*ia'-a-su*) of the people of Samaria, and from the Tyrians and Sidonians. I went to the great sea in the west and set up a lordly statue of myself in Arvad, which is in the sea. I went up to Lebanon and cut 100 mighty beams of cedar as timber for my palace and temples. I received the tax of all the kings of Nairu-land.

* * *

The stele is dedicated to the storm-god, Hadad in the Bible, Adad to the Assyrians. Zamahu may be the name of Tell al Rimah in use at this time. "Hittite" as used here means only North Syria in a geographical sense.

Arvad is an island off the coast of Syria, but Nairu is the region south of Lake Van

The historical context can now be considered. The Adad-nirari named was the third king of Assyria to bear that name, and he is considered to have ruled from 811-783 B.C. by many scholars, though 810-782 might be correct. He is not named in the Bible. Mari' of Damascus is known from other Assyrian records as the king of Damascus following Hazael. He is therefore the third king mentioned in the Bible with the name Ben-Hadad, and this particular one occurs in II Kings 13: 22-25. The passage tells how Josiah (Jehoash is a fuller form of his name), son of Jehoahaz, took back from Ben-Hadad cities which Hazael had taken from his father. Thus there is general agreement between the Books of Kings and the new document. The period was one of Assyrian expansion in all directions, and Damascus for a long time led resistance in Syria, while simultaneously oppressing the Hebrews to the south as opportunity permitted. Thus when Damascus was hard pressed in the north, they were forced to cease attacks on the Hebrews to their south. Previously known documents from the same Assyrian king gave the information that his attacks on Damascus, while not causing the fall of the city, at least forced the ruler to send tribute. This new stele proves that these attacks took place in the time of Joash, so that we now know how he was able to achieve his success. There is no mention in Kings of Joash's paying tribute, but

it would be quite natural for him to attempt to keep on the right side of the Assyrians while they were—for their own sake, not for his—providing his salvation. II Kings 13: 12 does make clear that only a selection of incidents from the reign were included.

So far, so good. Unfortunately the matter of chronology is not settled so easily. Kings offers the lengths of reigns and synchronisms with the kings of the other kingdom. Any who have tried to set out a chronological scheme have soon found that all kinds of difficulties and apparent contradictions arise so that no clear, simple scheme can be constructed. Part of the problem lies in differing systems of computation. Kings definitely makes use of the inclusive method, i.e. the first and last years of a reign are both counted as one, so that the total given should be reduced by one to correspond with our system. Even in this respect it is not sure that this is the only kind of reckoning used: our system may also be in use for part of the evidence. In any case there are more substantial problems. Some expositors assume co-regencies or interregnums to account for surplus or lacking years in the scheme. However, this technique soon assumes the character of undignified numerical juggling, and while harmony can be obtained this way, many mutually contradictory schemes have resulted. The fact is that Kings does not provide the material from which a complete and exact list of dates B.C. can be worked out.

For ordinary business purposes the Assyrians had a system of year names not used elsewhere. Each calendar year one high state official gave his name to the year. For that year he was *limu*. It is not known if being *limu* involved any duties or obligations other than use of the personal name for that year. The king held this office for his first or second full year, and then in turn it was held by the highest court officials and other officers of the realm. If the king was long on the throne, and the eligible officers had all held this office, then the king would a second time become *limu*, followed by the same sequence of officers as before. Thus in Assyria a year was described as

"in the *limu*-office of So-and-so." To use such a system, consecutive lists of these officers had to be kept, and we have such lists written c. 650 B.C. A complete run of the names can be reconstructed from 910-649. There was also a more elaborate kind of list, in which not only the names of the officers, but also their other titles were given, and then in addition a short phrase describing the most important event in the year was given in a third column. This type is preserved from 816 to about 700. Of course however careful the copying of these Assyrian lists errors can occur, and in two or three places there is doubt about one name, and so one year. However, this is not serious, and there is confirmation that save for an odd year here and there the list is otherwise reliable. An event of the year in one of the more complex lists is an eclipse of the sun. From knowledge of the history of the period an approximate date can be worked out, but astronomy allows the exact dating of this eclipse to 15th June 763 B.C. This is an absolute peg for fixing the whole list of officers. At its lower end, that is toward the end of the Assyrian empire, there is a whole mass of interlocking evidence for chronology. Babylonian, Greek, and other, which has long been known and everywhere accepted. This confirms the reliability of the lists of officers.

To break up the monotony of these lists, the scribes drew lines across the columns immediately before the

names of the kings, to mark the beginnings of their reigns, and some copies even sum up the reigns by adding "so many years" immediately above these lines. The lines always presume that the king was *limu* in his first full year, though modern scholars have suspected that in some cases at least it was in the second full year. This might seem a trivial point, but it has consequences of some importance. The kings in their royal annals depart from standard Assyrian usage by dating their campaigns in some cases by the years of reign, e.g. "In the second year of my reign I went to . . ." Such dating cannot be correlated with the *limu* lists with exactitude unless we know in which year of his reign a king was *limu*. This problem occurs in connection with Adad-nirari III, since a fair case has been made that Shalmaneser III and Tiglath-pileser III were both *limu* only in their second years. There are king lists giving the sequence of kings and their years of reign, and if the point is accepted for the two kings mentioned, and the evidence of the king lists is also accepted, then all the kings between Shalmaneser III and Tiglath-pileser III must similarly have been *limu* only in their second years. Adad-nirari III occurs in these kings.

To return, then, to Joash and Adad-nirari III. The condition of Assyria was altogether unusual at this time. Normally it was a military state ruled from the centre with rigorous authority. But Adad-nirari was a weak king. His mother, the Semiramis of Classical legend, exercised much power, and in the provinces the governors were becoming independent authorities putting themselves on a level with the king, something that never happened under a strong ruler. The stele from Tell al Rimah was in fact erected by one of the provincial governors, Nergal-eresh, and while the first 12 lines that we have translated are typical for Assyrian royal inscriptions generally, the remaining nine lines describe the territory seized by Nergal-eresh. He evidently feared what might happen when things returned to normal, for the last line reads: "Whoever erases any one of these lines, may the great gods glare at him furiously." As we now see, the warning was disregarded, and

Lists of Kings

Assyria*

Shalmaneser III	859-824 B.C.
Shamshi-Adad V	824-811 B.C.
Adad-nirari III	811-783 B.C.

Israel (Samaria)

Ahab	22 years
Ahaziah	2 years
Jehoram	12 years
Jehu	28 years
Jehoahaz	17 years
Joash	16 years

(*The figures given may all be one too high.)

the offending nine lines were chiselled off, but not so much as to prevent us reading most of them.

This was not the only stele erected by Nergal-eresh. In 1905 another one was found in the same area, a little damaged, but without any erased section. A campaign of Adad-nirari III against Palestine is described: "In the fifth year that I gloriously sat on my throne, I called up my land and ordered the numerous Assyrian troops to march against Palestine. . . ." The only details given are of Mari' being compelled to pay tribute, and the figures differ from the Rimah stele, but that need not disturb us as there is yet a third document from this reign, a slab from one of the Assyrian cities, Nimrud, which also describes this same campaign and gives figures for tribute that differ from both of the stele! The value of their combined testimony lies in the datum that it was the fifth year of Adad-nirari in which the west was subdued, and both Damascus and Israel paid tribute.

The problem now is whether the fifth year is to be reckoned on the assumption that this king was *limu* in his first, or in his second full year. The full form of the list of officers is preserved for this reign, and if the second full year is taken, the fifth year will be 806, when the campaign was "to the Mannans," a people living in the mountains east of Assyria, exactly the opposite direction from Syria. This cannot be reconciled with the evidence of the stele and slab, since the campaign in Syria was a major one, of which it is recorded with pride that it was accomplished "within one year." We cannot then assume that an officer of the king was campaigning in Syria while his royal master with most of the army was in the eastern mountains. If we reject the modern arguments that some Assyrian kings were *limu* in their second years, and accept at face value the evidence of the ancient lists, the fifth year was 805, and the campaign of that year was "to Arpad." Arpad was a North Syrian town while the places mentioned in the stele and slab are all in southern Syria. No other year in the full form of the *limu* lists indicates a campaign in this region. ("To the sea" for 802 means the Sea-land, the area

adjacent to the Persian Gulf, since Assyrian kings did not bathe.)

These are the facts from the various Assyrian sources and any interpretation must be in the nature of a hypothesis. There are no grounds for doubting the various items from the several sources. No doubt the campaign in Syria and Palestine was in the fifth year, and no doubt there was a campaign against Arpad in the same year. Perhaps the success with Arpad was really achieved by the king, while the rest of the victories to the south were largely won with the help of Nergal-eresh. Since it would be known that Nergal-eresh was erecting monuments to his own glory as well as to that of the king, the central administration might decide that the brief phrase used to sum up the year's campaigning should refer to that which the king himself did, and not to something for which Nergal-eresh could claim credit. This is mere hypothesis, but something of the sort could have occurred.

Thus the Assyrian evidence has the same kind of problem as the Biblical chronology. The two sets of records can be compared further. Ahab is mentioned in the sixth year of Shalmaneser III, and Jehu in the 18th. Between these two kings came Ahaziah (2 years) and Jehoram (12 years). By inclusive reckoning the two add up to 12, so it is just possible to squeeze them in the 12 years of Shalmaneser, and this then implies that Jehu paid tribute to the Assyrians as soon as he came to the throne. Historically this is likely, since he was at that moment engaged in war with Damascus, and it would be politically wise to ally himself to Damascus's enemy. However, from Shalmaneser's 18th year, 841 or 840, to the fifth year of Adad-nirari III, 806 or 805, there are only 37 years. According to Kings, Jehu reigned 28 years and Jehoahaz 17, giving a total by inclusive reckoning of 43 years, after which Joash succeeded to the throne. Clearly something is wrong, but with present knowledge the problem has to be left open. This is typical of many archaeological finds in relation to the Bible. Often they shed most valuable light in unexpected quarters, but often they also bring problems of their own, which only further discoveries will solve.

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE

THE TRIAL, crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord Jesus took place 1939 years ago in approximately A.D. 30.

The world Jesus lived in was considerably different from ours. There was only one great power-bloc—the Roman Empire. The people ate different food, and wore different clothes. They used different methods of transport, and spoke a different language. How then can the crucifixion by the Romans of someone who to them seemed a Jewish rebel-leader have anything to do with us today?

In a book called *They Met At Calvary*, W. E. Sangster poses the question, "Were you there?" That's the question being asked in this article. Were you there—at Golgotha? Was I?

How We Crucified Him

In an obvious sense we were not standing by the cross in A.D. 30. Yet when we look into the circumstances surrounding the trial and crucifixion, we will find that in a certain sense we really were there.

Take the people involved in Jesus' condemnation.

There was the crowd that shouted, "Crucify Him." There had been another crowd too—those who a week before had greeted Him with palms and shouted "Hosanna" as he rode into the city on a colt. It may be that the two crowds consisted of the same people, though probably not. The crowd from Palm Sunday would most likely be in their beds asleep when Jesus was before Pilate on trial. The crowd who cried, "Crucify Him," would be the riff-raff of Jerusalem, probably less than 100 in number in the narrow street outside the Roman headquarter building. They were no doubt bribed or threatened by the priests to shout for Jesus' blood.

Perhaps we would count ourselves out from this group. But can we really? We may not be the dregs of society, but our motives may be the same as that crowd's. Have we never been carried along with the crowd? It is difficult to act differently when you are in a large group, especially if they are your friends.

Mostly not much harm is done. But in some situations, as here, there was, and it is the principle that matters. Had we been there on that

Were You There?

by Ian McHaffie

Day: Friday

Season: Passover

Year: A.D. 30

Place: Golgotha

Occasion: Crucifixion of a certain
Jesus of Nazareth ("The King of
the Jews")

night, we too—through fear or the influence of the crowd—might well have shouted, "Crucify Him!"

Then there was that other crowd, the one which gave Jesus the triumphal entry. What of them? They were at home. Had they no responsibility? "I didn't know what was happening," said one. "It was late at night," said another, "I couldn't keep the family up." "I heard of it," said a third, "but what could I do?"

These issues still affect us today. How much responsibility did the German people (or the British, come to that) bear for what happened in the 1930s? The same excuses are given. We didn't know. We couldn't do anything. But people did know, and it was their duty to find out. Hitler was supported by mass rallies: the people could have stayed away. Governments go to great lengths with propaganda to persuade the ordinary people that their government or their type of economy is the best possible. Clearly, what the ordinary people think concerns the leaders in some way. What the ordinary people thought concerned the leaders in Jesus' time too.

Remember how we are told that the priests would have had Jesus arrested earlier but "they feared the people." So too Pilate. He knew Jesus was innocent, but, it says, he was "willing to content the people," so he sent Jesus to his death.

What people like you and me *do* think and *do* act upon does make a difference. We can present the same excuses for inaction. We didn't know. We couldn't do anything. But they will not be accepted. We can say that we did not know that two-thirds of the world is underfed, or that two million houses in Britain are unfit to live in. But if we don't know, it is because we are wilfully ignorant. We can all read, and this information is in the pages of our newspapers every week. If we do not help, it is because we do not wish to bother, not because the task is too great.

When we ignore intentionally, or culpably, our responsibilities as ordinary people, we are acting like the crowds in Jerusalem, the crowd who preferred not to know and the crowd which shouted for the crucifixion. In so far as we exhibit the same faults as these crowds, we were

there—condemning Jesus. We were there and we are there.

But Not Us: We Are Religious People

But perhaps we do not like to compare ourselves with a crowd in the streets of Jerusalem. After all, we are *religious* people, and we keep well clear of such company.

However, the crowds, though responsible, were not the most to blame. Those most responsible were the religious leaders, the Pharisees and the priests.

If we look at these people we see ourselves there also.

The Pharisees were like ourselves. They set out to reach a higher standard than their fellow Jews, and they succeeded. They were good men, most of them, though there is a bad apple in every barrel. That they were good men was what made them fall. They felt themselves to be so good that whatever anyone else did that was different *must* be *wrong*.

It was this narrow-mindedness and their self-satisfaction that brought them into conflict with Jesus. It was not just that Jesus did not keep every particular of their law that worried them. For it was the Pharisees alone, and they were few indeed, who did manage to keep their law in every detail. The trouble with Jesus was that He was popular with the people. What He said carried weight. What He said contradicted what the Pharisees said. Clearly, this Jesus was leading the people astray.

But He angered the Pharisees by more than just that. He hit them where it hurt most, by criticising their faults and by showing how imperfect they really were. Their reaction is the instinctive reaction of most of us when we are criticised and when we know the criticism really strikes home because it is true. Instead of changing our conduct and correcting our faults, we justify ourselves and try to remove the person who is a reproach to our conscience.

Good can evoke two responses. From a few it calls forth the response of love and the desire to be good also; from the majority it evokes indifference or hate. "This is the

judgment," said Jesus, "that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light" (John 3: 19). This is what happened to the Pharisees. Jesus showed them to be wrong in matters in which they cared most. They reacted as children of darkness: they set out to destroy Him.

The parallel with our reaction to good and to those who show themselves to be better than we are is clear. We criticise and find fault. In so doing, we stand with the Pharisees as those who put Christ to death.

Along with the Pharisees there were the priests. What did they have against Jesus?

The priests were rich; they were the aristocracy. The priests were powerful; they co-operated with the Romans and were given positions of responsibility in exchange.

While everything in Jerusalem remained quiet, they were doing well: power from the Romans, money from the pilgrims visiting the Temple. But the arrival of Jesus made things politically dangerous. The clearing of the currency exchange bureaux out of the Temple not only hit the priests' pockets (and it did not do that for long) but also risked Roman intervention to keep the peace. That might well have meant the loss of the priests' privileged positions.

Had the disturbance on that single day in the Temple been all that had happened, the affair could have rested there. But Jesus did miracles, and the crowds followed Him. Why. He could have led a revolt against Rome with a following like His! And what would happen to the priests then?

Clearly, Christ had to go. But see again the reasons. Jesus affected the priests' financial situation and seemed to prejudice their power and influence.

It is very easy to have one's judgment affected by money. Ideally we approve of hard measures if they are needed to help the country out of her economic rut. We don't mind a hard budget which taxes cigarettes, drink and petrol—provided that we don't smoke, drink or drive! We are less happy with the Government if

the budget imposes taxes that do affect us.

Have you ever noticed how people who are most anti-communist or anti-socialist, even in the Brotherhood, are those involved in big business, those who make their money—and lots of it—by the economic processes of a capitalist society? The real issues should be the good of mankind, but financial considerations easily overshadow moral ones. When we let them, we are guilty of the death of Jesus.

Power, as that of the priests, also corrupts. No one likes to give up positions of influence whether in the world or in the ecclesia. Such positions enhance our personal standing. They make us feel good, and any threats which may diminish our influence have to be opposed. The overall good of the situation is not considered without bias. Our own good too often comes first, and we drive another nail into the tree on which Christ is crucified.

There were other characters involved in the death of Jesus at whom we could also look. There is Judas, the follower turned traitor, and there is a lesson here. There is Pilate, with whom the favour of the crowd was more important than the setting free of an innocent man. But my point has been made.

There is an expression in the Letter to the Hebrews which describes what we mean exactly. It says that Christians who fall away from the faith are crucifying the Son of God afresh (Hebrews 6: 6). That is how we can say that we met at Calvary, that we were there, that we are there. For every time we act with the same motives as the crowd—lack of concern on the one hand, being influenced wrongly by our friends on the other; every time we act with the motives of the Pharisees and priests: self-righteousness, corruption from money and power, caring only for ourselves; every time we act with these motives, we crucify Christ again in our time, and we stand at the foot of the cross, exposed in our sinfulness and condemned.

Yes. We were all there, with all men of every age and generation. We are all guilty.

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE

On The Same Side As Christ

But we who are Christians have in addition the privilege of being at Calvary in a different way, in a way that liberates and does not condemn.

Those who stood on the hill of Golgotha were not only those who derided and scoffed and those who drove in the nails.

There were the women in whose presence Jesus had spent much time. There were some of His followers, perhaps even some of his scattered disciples who had crept back to watch from a distance. They were responsible for Jesus' death in the same way as you and I now are: by their sinful nature. Yet they were on His side.

There were also those who had offered Him drugged wine to ease the pain. It seems that there was a society of women in Jerusalem which devoted itself to relieving the last agonies of crucified criminals, of whom there were many at that time. Jesus chose to suffer in full consciousness, but we can be sure that He appreciated the intentions of those who offered the drug. They too were with Him, on His side.

So too can we be. We also can serve Him in His need. And how? Was it not Jesus Himself who took a little child and said, "Whoever receives this child in my name receives me?" On the day of judgment Jesus will say, "As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me."

It is our privilege to serve Christ on His cross even today. When we help an old person in need, when we aid a blind person to cross a busy road, when we speak to someone who is lonely, when we send money to help a wounded child in Vietnam, we are serving Jesus on His cross.

Crucified On The Cross With Christ

There is an even deeper sense in which we can be there at the Place of the Skull. We have seen how we are present as Christ's crucifiers, present also as His helpers in distress. But there is also a sense in which Christians are in fact crucified on that cross along with their Lord.

They too are there, suffering *on* the cross.

This would seem to be the meaning of Paul's somewhat obscure words in Colossians where he says: "I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is behind (or what is lacking) in Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is the church" (Colossians 1: 24).

It appears that Paul is saying that Christ's sufferings on the cross were not something finished for ever once they were over. Suffering is ingrained in the very substance of the universe. It is only suffering that can get things done. It is suffering that draws men out of themselves and shows them another dimension to life. (Not all suffering, in general only that which is willingly undertaken.) Christians can take a share in the sufferings of Christ. To do this is to complete, in Paul's words, what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ.

Wherever, then, as Christians we suffer for our beliefs, to an extent we are suffering on the cross with Jesus. The suffering may come in many forms. For some, like Martin Luther King, it involves death; for others, rejection by family or friends. For us it may mean no more than lack of enthusiasm or co-operation in the work for Christ from among our friends or our brethren and sisters. Or it may mean struggling to overcome some bad habit, or avoiding making the biting reply when we get annoyed that we would so much love to make. All this is suffering with Christ, and in doing so we too are crucified with Him.

We Were There

We can be present at that meaningful scene on Calvary in three ways. We can be there as the crucifiers, we can be there as the comforters, and we can be there as the crucified.

There is a spiritual progression. The more we become followers of Christ, the more we crucify our old selves, the less we are like those who put Christ to death and the more we are like those who comforted Him. Above all, the more we are like the crucified Christ—crucified with Him, and suffering with Him—yet assured of a glorious resurrection as was His 1,939 years ago this Easter.

Greater Things by Ralph Lovelock

Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? I am not myself the source of the words I speak to you: it is the Father who dwells in me doing his own work. Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else accept the evidence of the deeds themselves. In truth, in very truth I tell you, he who has faith in me will do what I am doing; and he will do greater things still because I am going to the Father. Indeed anything you ask in my name I will do, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you ask anything in my name I will do it. John 14: 10-14.

THE ABOVE PASSAGE is one of the more difficult in John's writings for us to understand. Despite the difficulty, however, we ought not to dismiss them from our attention, because not only are they the words of Jesus Himself, but they are one of His most important sayings in that they are prefaced with the double "amen" (translated here as "in truth, in very truth"). They are not intended only for the earliest disciples, because they have the very general phrase, "he who has faith in me," to describe the man to whom they apply, and to claim that they do not apply to centuries beyond the first is to claim that in no other time have men had "faith in Jesus" in the full biblical implication of that term.

The ministry of Jesus was marked by His outstanding work in the healing of disease. That this was a cardinal point in the ministry is witnessed by Peter. When he had to find a brief phrase to describe the significance of that ministry, he said to Cornelius, "He went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him" (Acts 10: 38). One of the features brought out in the Gospel narratives is that those who were "demon possessed" never failed to recognise Jesus for what he was, and to make public profession. To this

James alludes when he says, "You have faith enough to believe that there is one God. Excellent! The devils have faith like that, and it makes them tremble" (2: 19). The same characteristic was to be seen in the slave girl (Acts 16: 16-18). Around the end of the second century, when Tertullian wrote his *Apology*, he claimed that the same phenomenon was to be seen where paganism confronted Christianity. This work was addressed to his pagan detractors, and the passage concerned is offered as a challenge to them in proof that their own gods are demons in process of being banished by Christ. Had there been no substance in this claim, he could not have made it in this context.

There is no doubt that some of the works of Jesus were works of power such as are presented in Old Testament times; such miracles as the feeding of the multitude and the raising of the dead. But it was not to these specific and outstanding examples that Peter referred, but rather to the many and continuous exercises of healing which brought crowds to His presence. One of the significant narratives is that of the man let down through the roof. When Jesus saw him, His first words of comfort were, "My son, your sins are forgiven." Thus, in this case at least, He saw in the suffering, one who was sick in spirit as well as in body. That Jesus saw in much of the sickness which He healed an underlying cause which sprang from evil in opposition to God is confirmed by His reply to the Jews recorded in Luke ch. 11. The same implication is there in the 13th chapter when he says of the woman healed on the sabbath, "And here is this woman, a daughter of Abraham, who has been kept prisoner by Satan for eighteen long years: was it wrong for her to be freed from her bonds on the Sabbath?" The matter is clinched by the parable of the seven evil spirits (Luke 11: 24-26) spoken in this same context of healing. It was Luke the physician who records these sayings, and had they not been

intended to imply more than physical failing, he of all the writers would have been tempted to water down the implications.

The Roman Church has always had a claim to be able to heal. In her case, however, it is not the continuous mission of healing at all times and in all places which characterised the Gospel ministry. Rather, she has laid claim to the outstanding examples of miraculous power, and allied them with a crude magical background such as pieces of the true cross, and fragments of the shroud, and special shrines where "Saints" have been visitants. It is because these claims, which bear no resemblance to the Gospel miracles, have been so universally associated with the promise of Jesus which we are considering, that that promise has been ignored by a great number of Christians. If we are to take the words of Jesus seriously, however, we cannot ignore so important a statement just because a section of His followers has prostituted them for monetary gain. We ought to look carefully at all sections of professing Christianity, to see if there has been any evidence that the mission of healing has been practised.

The first in order of time is in the New Testament itself. This, another of the "awkward" passages, comes in the last eight verses of James' Epistle. This is not an appeal to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but to the routine business of the Christian life. It is the "prayer of a good man," not the miracle of the exceptional one, which works the healing. It is a general rule, "Send for the elders of the congregation," not for the Apostle who may be there, nor even for the one elder who may have been given the gift of healing by the laying on of an Apostle's hands. Of equal significance is the context in which the reference to healing comes; the associations in the mind of James are significant. The instances which instantly spring to his mind are pagan opposition in the days of Elijah, and the sinning by backsliding again in his own pagan surroundings. Here we have a continuity of association between the words of Jesus ("bound by Satan") and those of Tertullian which associates the "demons" of illness with the impurities of paganism.

Throughout the history of Chris-

tianity, particularly in those sections which had seceded from the Roman Church, there has been a tradition of "healing ministry." The orthodox Church, however, has managed to throw a mantle of opprobrium over those Churches, and it is difficult in these days to know how much credulity we can place in the scant records which have survived. There is no need for us to delve back into history, however, for there is a numerous practising group today who claim to be exercising the ministry of healing as originally instituted by Jesus. Even though we may disagree violently with their tenets, that is no reason why we should not examine their practices; it was Jesus who laid down the criterion amongst a generation which strongly disapproved of His disciples: "by their fruits ye shall know them."

These people are not "sectarian," and those who comprise them are members of many different groups of practising Christians. The Spiritualists, ever ready to take advantage when opportunity offers, have infiltrated widely and effectively into the movement. Because they (the Spiritualists) are inveterate propagandists, one normally finds printed reference to the ministry within their works. This should not be allowed to prejudice the issue however. One of the leading and most successful of such healers has declared publicly that the healer has no power of himself; that he is merely a channel through which the power of God is operative for healing; and that the healer has no knowledge of the spiritual channels through which God works with him. The practice is known widely as "spiritual healing" to distinguish it from the other forms currently advanced by particular Churches.

This is no "hole and corner" practice carried out by a few people in secrecy. There are some hundreds of regularly practising healers operating in this country, all of whom hold at least one, and most of them several, open sanctuaries to which the public may come free of charge every week. They neither claim to work instantaneous miracles of complete cure, nor are they chary of publicity. In order to bring the service to the notice of those in need, public demonstrations of healing are held from time to time. At such demonstrations sufferers in the hall

are invited on to the platform for treatment in public, and after the demonstration has terminated all sufferers are invited to a mass healing at which a large number of healers attend.

Two points which they emphasise must be borne in mind. Those attending are mainly medical rejects who have been ill for many years; the body has acclimatised itself to illness, and cure will be gradual. Secondly, the healers lay no claim to be able to cure all cases, death must come at last; they can alleviate both mental and physical suffering however. It is an established fact that a large number of those receiving hospital treatment today have some form of neurotic trouble in addition. There is no doubt that these healers give much relief to the troubled in mind, often following a treatment very similar to that of the medical profession. It is also beyond doubt that in cases such as arthritis they are able to give physical manipulation without causing pain, and to bring about a considerable alleviation of the patient's living conditions. This is not a group of ignorant "quacks," a few of them were medically qualified and practising before they commenced this work, and a number of hospitals now allow them to operate within their precincts.

Whatever we may think about the persons involved, there is no shadow of a doubt that they are doing a great service of mercy to thousands of sufferers. In view of the passage we are considering, the question we should ask ourselves is whether, as followers of Jesus, we should be taking some steps to seek out the troubled in body and mind, and to seek alleviation of their suffering, whether they are interested in our theology or not. These other people are demonstrating that it can be done, if we are willing to put ourselves at considerable inconvenience and aesthetic displeasure. To a large extent it was this exercise of "compassion" which characterised the person of Jesus, and attracted the people to Him. We often ask ourselves why the first-century preaching was so successful, and ours so futile. This, at least, is one basic difference between the two, and in view of the statement we are considering, one which should give us cause for serious questioning.

Reviews

What to Preach

G. W. Target, *Evangelism Inc.* Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1968, 42s.

G. W. TARGET is a man with an axe to grind. And after grinding, he wields it. Many are the heads that roll—evangelical heads of all kinds, from Christadelphian to Catholic.

But G. W.'s main target is Billy Graham, "the John F. Kennedy of revivalists" (as Malcolm Muggeridge wrote, to whom this book is dedicated). And throughout most of *Evangelism Inc.* the reader is constantly reminded of the great evangelist's proficiency at deceiving and exploiting vulnerable people and at pushing them into a dubious acceptance of a shallow form of Christianity by questionable methods, with ultimately very little success. With untiring zeal, the author exposes Billy Graham as the gruesome manipulator of human emotions, who has no respect for people as people, or as conscious beings with a measure of personal integrity. People are conned into Christianity when their defences are down.

Billy Graham is well aware of the methods which can create the right emotional atmosphere, the right kinds of environmental stimulation to employ, and the right words to say to the attentive crowd. George Target explains it as the shrewd and calculated application of psychological techniques; for Billy Graham this is the work of the Holy Spirit.

Hardly anything of Graham's public or private life escapes Target's critical eye. Not only does he attack Graham's type of preaching and his organisation, but he asks the reader to consider what manner of man this is. He labels Graham as an obsessional neurotic—the victim of repressed aggressive and sexual drives. Thus Billy Graham's witness for Christ is merely the acting out of his neurotic conflicts.

Although it is fashionable in this post-Freudian era to explain the validity of what a man says by reference to the motivating factors of his

personality which cause him to say it, the disconcerting fact is that the same kind of argument can be turned against the one who uses it. The reader may well ask why, with such singular intensity, does G. W. Target attack Billy Graham so. Indeed, Mr Target doth protest too much.

Perhaps some of the truth lies in the author's own experience, which is not revealed in the book, but was referred to on a television programme. Once, for "one far fierce hour and sweet" G. W. Target believed Billy Graham. Then came the realization that he had been deceived, for which, it appears, he has never forgiven him.

Although the author may have demolished big brash American evangelism to his own satisfaction the reader is not told what alternatives may be suggested in this age to preach Christianity. Even if people will not tolerate an authoritarian Bible-punching know-all, neither will they settle for an English middle-class liberal intellectualism.

Neither is it sufficient just to explain away emotional conversion as some kind of psychological conditioning and abreactive process. For a cold, deliberate, rationalistic form of intellectual conversion is in theory just as explicable in psychological terms as an emotional one. (Provided of course that we assume the validity of these kinds of psychological explanation in the first place—a problem of too great a magnitude to be discussed here.)

What Christians may have to come to realize (and G. W. Target is a Christian) is that religious affiliation and expression are perforce multifarious in order to satisfy the needs of the many different intellects and personalities which constitute the Church of Christ. Just because the outward and visible sign of one form of religion does not appeal to one particular type of Christian it does not mean that it ought not to appeal to others.

Much of what Mr Target has to say in his book is perceptive and

stimulating; yet much is tedious and unfair; much is prejudice and personal antipathy disguised as objective appraisal; and most of it is iconoclastic.

By lacking any constructive suggestions the book raises many fundamental questions not only relating to the problem of the influence of human personality on projecting Christianity, as seen in Billy Graham, one-time brush salesman, but the more radical problem of the real value of any kind of preaching in a secular post-Victorian society.

Evangelism Inc. ends rather oddly, in describing a society denied the force and vitality of a Billy Graham, yet saved from complete insipidity by evangelical salt:—

There is little doubt that organized Christianity as we know it will continue to decline. . . . In this decline the liberals and moderates will slide away into a sort of holy humanism, whereas the Evangelicals, "full of passionate intensity," will survive as a recognisable group . . . less and less effectual, more and more enragedly impotent, but valuable grit and pungent flavour in a society growing dangerously bland and tasteless.

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in preaching, that grace may abound?

P. R. PEARSON.

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE A Christadelphian Review

Published on the 18th day of the last month in each quarter

Articles and general correspondence should be addressed to:

The Endeavour Magazine,
Moray Lodge,
176 Granton Road,
Edinburgh, 5.

Views expressed in the magazine are not necessarily those of the Editorial Committee, but may be published because they make a valuable contribution to discussion.

A Time for Action

(ii)

by David Preston

"WE STAND ON the shore of an ocean, crying to the night and the emptiness, sometimes a voice cries out of the darkness. But it is the voice of one drowning, and in a moment the silence returns." Thus Bertrand Russell in his autobiography describes how he sees the life of man. Man is a lonely child in the darkness with no one to lead him and nowhere to go but the grave. For Russell the only tenable philosophy in a world where all are linked by the prospect of a common doom is one built on the foundation of unyielding despair.

Death, the modern taboo

For countless generations man's loneliness in the unfriendliness of infinite space has been assuaged by the comforts of religion. Like Cleopatra, man has immortal longings in him and these longings have been fostered by the Church which has traded men's allegiance in this life for the prospect of bliss in the next.

Today all this has changed. People now view the prospect of oblivion either with a degree of equanimity or regard all talk of death as taboo. High material standards in many parts of the world so cushion us from reality that death becomes a natural break as remote, and perhaps until it happens to oneself as unreal, as the pre-packed moms in the TV commercials. If religion is in part what man does with his solitariness, there is no apparent need for religion today because there is no solitariness. For

today the empty spaces are filled for us. We are invited to bow down before the altar of bingo and prostrate ourselves before the idols of "pop."

A contradictory world

And yet we live in an unhappy world full of conflicting tendencies. The technological revolution has produced changes of such magnitude and of such far reaching effect that man's ability to cope with its consequences has long ago been outstripped. It is the speed of this change and our inability to adjust to it which presents us with so many unique and apparently insoluble problems.

Today's world is one of enormous opportunities for the development of personal life to the full. High material standards are within reach of the majority rather than the few, at least in industrial nations. Public services have done much to eliminate the degradation and despair which poverty brings. Educational opportunities have opened up new horizons for all who care to grasp them. But against these (and partly as a result of them) must be balanced the ever-growing tendency for the individual to become absorbed in the mass, and the many ways in which individuality is discouraged and conformity encouraged.

Professor M. V. C. Jeffreys in *Personal Values in the Modern World* remarks that the greatest danger to our civilisation is "the

destruction of those (personal) values which alone make human relations spiritually productive and any civilisation worth while." In spite of his spectacular scientific achievements mankind will never begin to come of age until he recognises that this destruction is far advanced, that the darkness is closing in and that the inexorable march of time reduces the circle from which regeneration can come.

The communications breakdown

One important consequence of the tumultuous growth in knowledge in recent years (there have been more fundamental discoveries in all the sciences during the past 30 years than in the whole of previous history) has been the loss of a unified view of life. Our world is now so complex that each of us has a different window on the world. Even scientists within the same discipline often find it difficult to speak a common language. It is ironical to observe that the greater and more sophisticated that world-wide communications become the less we find it possible to communicate meaningfully with one another. And all the time the generation gap yawns ever wider.

Leadership in every walk of life must always come from the top. But if those in power can only understand a small fragment of what is happening around them, if politicians, educators and religious leaders alike cannot find a view of

life which embraces the whole of society it is little wonder that the ordinary man finds himself lost and unable to find his way.

This is precisely the situation today and never more so than in the realm of moral judgments.

The confusion of values

Lord Eccles, a one-time Minister of Education, puts his finger on the problem facing political leaders when he says, "Having all but packed in our Christian tradition we are trying to hold our own in this exploding world with no working model of human nature. Can the Prime Minister rely on industry and the public generally to carry out the Incomes Policy? All Cabinet Ministers now stick their heads in the sands of economics, relying on society being held together by an accepted system of morals, when the patent fact is that the Christian source of this system of morals . . . no longer commands the loyalty of those whose example sways the rest."

Perhaps we must place our hopes on the future generation of adults, the product of our improving school system. But here also morally insecure teenagers all too often look in vain for teachers with characters founded on firm beliefs.

Contemporary religious authorities, too, seem to have lost all sense of moral direction. Mr Muggeridge is surely speaking no more than the truth when he says "From the days when the Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson used to expatiate in Canterbury Cathedral upon the Christian excellence of the late Stalin, to the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Woolwich's gay endorsement of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as an aid to Christian marriage, and on to even loftier heights of psychedelic piety, there is scarcely a contemporary absurdity which has not received some degree of clerical, if not episcopal, endorsement."

Wilful ignorance

Christadelphians are not conspicuous for the clarity of their views on modern problems if lecture titles and general discussion are anything to go by, rather concentrating their minds on a future when these prob-

lems will cease to exist. Nevertheless until they apply themselves to many of society's problems they will continue to lose the respect of their younger age groups. This involvement is not to compromise oneself with worldly affairs but a practical exercise in applying to this age the rules of the next. There must be a recognition, too, that many of the old reasons for moral actions have been exposed for the shams which they often were, that new moral problems have come into existence and old ones changed their forms.

Fornication, for example, was condemned in the past because of the danger of disease, or the fear of unwanted babies, or because God says it is wrong. Today the first two fears have largely been removed, whilst even people who do believe in God want to know why it is wrong. Did God make an arbitrary decision which could have been the reverse if He had felt like it? Or is there a deeper reason fundamental to the nature of man?

New problems need not be in the rarified atmosphere of heart transplants or test-tube babies. There is the growing problem of working mothers in relation to the stability of family life, the ability (and willingness) of a small group of dissident workers to hold a nation's industry to ransom.

And so one could go on with a Jeremiad list of the ills and problems which beset modern society. The fact remains that our problems are not primarily political or economic but moral. A fact recognised by the new American President in his inaugural address: "We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord here on earth. . . . We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. . . . To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit."

The necessity for vision

What the world needs today is not groups of so-called Christians abdicating their responsibilities but more men and women of clear purpose and firm resolve. It is as true today as it ever was that where there is no vision the people perish. Our society has rightly demolished much of the

hypocrisy that had become part of religion, but it has rejected everything else as well and left an empty void.

Against this void Christianity provides a vision, a framework within which to live. It sustains the unshakeable belief that there is a purpose in human history, that in the end Right will prevail. Given that lodestar even the darkest hours can be seen against the light of eternity.

There is also the knowledge that if society is full of contradictions it is because man who makes up society is himself full of contradictions. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves. . . ." Shakespeare, like all observers of humanity, knew that man's problem is man himself. Stephen Neill in *Christian Faith Today* asks, "Why is it that man, endowed with every gift needed to master the universe, is so wholly incapable of ruling himself? Why is it that man, made to love and be loved, should spend so much of his energy in useless hate? What is this strange disease at the heart of things?"

The challenge of Christianity

Nevertheless, unlike Lord Russell, for the Christian there is no room for despair. With its doctrines of sin and salvation it looks the facts about man squarely and at the same time offers the hope that, with God's help, he can be renewed. Not least, as Professor Jeffreys says, "By giving added meaning to personal relations and to the morality that proceeds from respect of person for person . . . it gives a clear reason why human personality is sacred . . . a sense of power for coping with the practical problems of life."

Here is something precious for all who have this belief. We can cherish it if we like by wrapping it up in a napkin. But if it means anything to us we shall want to share it with others. How we can communicate this is something we shall discuss next time. But communicate we must. In the first century the dynamism of these ideas burst upon an ageing world and turned it upside-down. That power is still there. It is our duty, and our responsibility to use it.

(To be continued)

(Continued from front page)

ambassador who must always leave the right impression on those met. But there are practical limits to this. Others are not necessarily so bad that exemplary conduct in personal relationships is altogether outstanding. Under such circumstances there may be a temptation to substitute a spurious ideal in place of a genuine one. One may imagine a merit where, in fact, none exists. For example, the general policies of the body to which one belongs may be assumed to have a validity whatever the character of the members. A socialist, for example, may consider that the policies of his party are the important thing, so that a few personal failings on his part are neither here nor there. The collective aims excuse these failings. A Christian cannot so easily take the same view. Of course he knows how worthless he is compared with Jesus Christ, and the gospel he preaches, has, as an unbeliever once said, been often preached but never practised, save for Jesus. But how can he preach the grace of God unless that is manifested in himself to some degree? This applies not only to the active missionary, but also to the average member whose preaching may be limited to a few comments on private occasions.

The embarrassment involved in this situation can lead to a further substitution: of priorities. To manifest the grace of God in one's life is

neither an exclusive ideal—Christians of all kinds consent to it—nor is it something ever fully achieved. There are ideals of a more exclusive kind, and which give the natural man more satisfaction. Christians who meet on Saturday instead of Sunday could begin to think that this in itself marks them out as the chosen few, and in the process neglect more important matters. This observance of Saturday does not usually involve any particular sacrifice, and there can be no doubt that the day has been well and properly observed. Other Christians stress their doctrinal differences from the rest. While it involves much self-discipline to manifest the grace of God in one's life, little time and effort are needed to adhere fully and rigorously to the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection and to reject with equal vehemence the Platonic doctrine of a personal, indestructible soul. It is encouraging to look back over the years and to feel that never once has one departed from sound Scriptural teaching. It is similarly satisfying to belong to a body which alone upholds truth in a world of error. In such a state priorities are easily confused. The natural man is back once more. Pride in self is now justified. The will of God has been rejected.

"Beware of substitutes" has been an advertiser's motto. The spiritual man should likewise make sure his faith is pure and not ersatz. His inability to achieve success is expected. It is God who gives the power to win victory.

Children's Home

The Children's Home is now well under way in the care of Bro. Derrik and Sis. Margaret Ayrton as house parents. In order to bring the home up to the full strength of ten children, we are in need of a residential assistant to the house parents.

As most will know the home is situated at Tutnall near Bromsgrove, and is organised by a trust. The trustees are John Newman, Gordon Rodgers, John Weaving and Albert Clifton (secretary). The home has been renamed Whitegates, to avoid confusion with names similar to its former name Tutnall Mount. We are anxious that it should be known and referred to as Whitegates rather than as a children's home, except where absolutely necessary as in this case, because we wish the children to feel that they are a part of a family and not an institution.

The present policy is to take children above the age of five and we now have eight children in residence, from six years of age to fifteen, and Derrik and Margaret have gone a long way to integrating them into a family.

The assistant we require should preferably be a lady but consideration would be given to a married couple or a person who would prefer not to be in permanent residence. Conditions and scale of pay are in accordance with that practised by the local authority. Will applicants please apply to Bro. Albert Clifton, 19 Walter Cobb Drive, Sutton Coldfield, Warks.

The Trustees of Whitegates.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Great Britain 10s. per annum.

Canada, U.S.A. and Australia
\$1.25. (By air mail \$2.50).

South Africa R1.00.

Single copies 2s. 6d. (post free).

Cheques, postal orders, etc. should be made payable to *The Endeavour Magazine*.

Subscriptions and all business communications should be sent to the appropriate address as follows:

Great Britain, Europe and South Africa
The Endeavour Magazine, 104 Lady Byron Lane,
Knowle, Solihull, Warwicks., England.

Canada and U.S.A.
The Endeavour Magazine, P.O. Box 1354, Baltimore,
Maryland - 21203, U.S.A.

Australia and New Zealand
The Endeavour Magazine, P.O. Box 213, Box Hill,
Victoria 3128, Australia.