

ficers? Very little, it would appear.

The theme which appears to be behind his entire article is that nuclear weapons are, in fact, so powerful and such a threat that they must be (in a sense) “opposed.” He fails to suggest what conscientious Christians ought to do in “combatting” the spread of nuclear weapons. He talks about what would happen if Christians in America renounced the bomb. What does he mean by “renouncing the bomb?” And how many Christians would be necessary to form a “critical mass” for such a spiritual “impact?” Surely many Christians in America already deplore the growth of nuclear weapons. Specifically, what more should we do?

Michael Scofield, senior systems analyst for Hunt-Wesson Foods, is also a regional representative for the Association of Adventist Forums.

No Threat to Eternal Security

by Tim Crosby

I was disappointed by Dybdahl’s article on nuclear weapons. Besides the arrogance of asserting that advocates of nuclear deterrence are denying the cross, Dybdahl’s logic does not convince.

Dybdahl’s implicit premise that the state should live by the rules of the church is as illegitimate as the premise that the church must live under the control of the state. The kingdoms of this world will not be gradually transformed into the kingdom of God, nor do they operate by the same rules Christ placed upon the church.

The use of military force is one of the approved methods of deterrence under the Old Testament system where the church is the state, and, even in the New Testament, Romans 13 is quite clear that there is a justified use of force by the state to deter evil, whether it employ the sword or a modern equivalent. Saying that America should dismantle its nuclear arsenal is like

saying that all policemen should surrender their guns. The same arguments apply. If nuclear weapons are wrong, so are 500-pound bombs, hand grenades, and guns—which have killed many times as many people as nuclear weapons have. But is a gun in the hands of a policeman an instrument of death, or is it an instrument of peace? Is a cruise missile in the hands of a peace-loving nation an instrument of death, or an instrument of peace?

Rather than worry about some hypothetical future catastrophe, is it not better to rid the earth of the evils at hand—say, tobacco and (erstwhile) slavery, to take two issues that are mentioned by Dybdahl and Walden—which have resulted in much greater suffering than nuclear weapons ever have?

Unlike smoking and owning slaves, being the victim of a nuclear attack carries no threat to one’s eternal security (and hence it is not “a threat to the temple of the Holy Spirit at least equal to smoking,” as Walden posits). Indeed, Dybdahl has given the strongest argument against his own position: “Nuclear weapons, despite their massive power of destruction, are not truly powerful. They may kill millions, but they cannot defeat a single person who trusts in the crucified Christ and follows his example.” Exactly. Yet there are other moral problems that *can* defeat a person by preventing him from trusting in Christ and following his example; by comparison with these problems the issue of nuclear weapons is trivial.

Timothy Crosby is the pastor of the Knoxville Grace Seventh-day Adventist Church in Knoxville, Tenn.

If Not Christians, Then Who?

by James W. Walters

Kudos for the special section “Adventists and the Bomb” (Vol. 14, No. 2). You managed to run three mutually exclusive

article-length arguments drawn from a denomination largely apathetic to the whole issue. The authors, my friends from Andrews University school days, couldn't be separated further ideologically.

My basic agreement with Ron Walden's anti-nuclear "Must Christians Oppose Nuclear Weapons?" is overwhelmed by my reservations on Eric Anderson's neoconservative "The Bishops and Peace" and Tom Dybdahl's pacifist "In God We Trust." The effect of both Anderson's and Dybdahl's pieces is confirmation—seemingly intentional—of existing Adventist near-indifference to the nuclear arms debate. Although the Anderson and Dybdahl articles themselves are poles apart, they both are equally contrary to basic Adventism's philosophy of wholism which bestows inseparable value upon the temporal and the eternal. Such a philosophy led Adventist pioneers to civil disobedience in devotion to the abolition of slavery, and appropriately leads contemporary Adventism into closer company with current United States Catholic bishops than with either Dybdahl or Anderson on nuclear arms.

Dybdahl takes a high, heavenly road beyond reach of any nuclear attack: "(Nuclear weapons) may kill millions, but they cannot defeat a single person who trusts in the crucified Jesus and follows his example." This assertion, which typifies the author's style of argumentation, encapsulates both the value and inadequacy of Dybdahl's position.

Dybdahl's pacifist position achieves its power through the author's single-minded confession of the "foolishness of the cross." Whether the cross "works" is an irrelevant question for Dybdahl. The cross is right. Passive acceptance of violence against one's self is mandatory for the Christian because Jesus accepted the cross. The author's contention is thoroughly religious and he disdains ordinary logic: "I have no arguments here for President Reagan or President Andropov; I have nothing to say about the wisdom of the world." Of such single

commitment and abandon are religious movements born, although few spiritual grandchildren continue the original singular world view.

Jesus himself was basically a pacifist, as Dybdahl correctly argues. He taught, lived out, and died for the ideal of non-violent *agape*. Jesus' death was an unfeigned, pacifist death without parallel as a dramatic demonstration of divine love. His death, ironically, became good news to the disciples, for it alone had pre-eminent power to sway the sinful human heart. We mortals stand in desperate need of the cross as an ideal to draw us out of self-obsession and on to commitment to others. I fully agree with Dybdahl's emphasis on the divine love which reaches its heights in the self-sacrifice of Jesus. Our Lord exemplified an exalted ethical principle.

But Christ's very example raises two most important issues: is Christian love the only principle to be considered? and, how far are Christians obligated to take a single-minded adherence to love? On the second question Dybdahl argues that there is no limit. Our only concern is the *imitatione Christi*. The cross is the Christian's paradigm for dealing with all issues—including that of a threatening global nuclear war. But I wonder, do we truly want judges to routinely turn society's other cheek and set criminals free? Further, should the international community let would-be Hitlers go unchallenged? Is society to receive no punitive challenge this side of the judgment? Pacifistic love, as compelling an ethical principle as it may be, does not itself offer a satisfactory answer to such questions.

Jesus' counsels of perfection (Matthew 5-7) and his passive acceptance of an unjust death were not a new, higher law replacing the Decalogue. His pacifist teaching sets a vision of an ideal fully attainable only in the coming Kingdom. He was not outlining the basis for current social policy. Even less were his counsels of perfection dicta for future social policy. Jesus, anticipating the imminent ending of the age, hyperbolically portrayed the most important but not the

only principle important for contemporary Christian decision-making.

Self-sacrificing love as Christian or secular social policy would be calculated mass suicide. Personal love must be balanced by societal justice. Often justice is love's most basic form in our fallen world. Justice is an equally important though less dramatic principle which must also enter the ethical calculation. Societal justice is the touchstone of Hebrew morality, and universal justice is the basis for the doctrine of final judgment. Just as single proof texts do violence to the rich multifaceted Bible story, so does the citing of single example proofs—even those of Jesus himself. The cross is too great and holy an event to be trivialized by our reading into it unwarranted meanings.

Whereas Dybdhal's Adventism uses divine trust as an overpass to transcend the nuclear arms issue, Eric Anderson provides the church a convenient bypass via the journalists, legislators, and military strategists who can be trusted to handle the matter.

It is no surprise that the U.S. Catholic bishops' pastoral letter "The Challenge of Peace" rates only a C+ as a statement on peacekeeping in Anderson's book. The document basically serves as a foil against which Anderson advances a particular nuclear arms strategy borrowed largely from the neo-conservative Albert Wohlstetter. Because of this essentially extrinsic interest in the pastoral letter, it is at least understandable why Anderson's criticisms are often less germane to the document than to building an alternative case. For instance, Anderson claims that the economic issue of nuclear arms at the expense of the poor is one of two "essential," "simplistic, liberal platitudes" in the letter. As a matter of fact, the lengthy document does not spend even one full page on the topic.

Anderson's basic quarrel with "The Challenge of Peace" deals with the bishops'

methodology and their content. Regarding the former, Anderson is bit inconsistent in his criticism, and in regard to the latter there is purely diametric opposition.

Methodology

Matters of national nuclear arms policy are best left to the experts, claims Anderson. However, if clergy must themselves get involved, their discussion should remain on the level of moral principles rather than in technical complexities beyond their competence. Interestingly, Anderson later criticizes the bishops for their lack of technological sophistication. The bishops, like most other peacemakers in the past 25 years, supposedly possess a "late-1950s" view of nuclear weapons: inaccurate nuclear devices which indiscriminately kill enemy civilians and military alike. Because of the bishops' supposed ignorance of modern accurate missiles their moralizing is largely irrelevant.

The bishops openly acknowledge their lack of technical expertise (although a Yale political science professor was a primary consultant), and merely claim to be religious teachers raising public ethical issues. However, the pastoral letter is only responsible as it is factually based, and here Anderson's charge is inaccurate.

The bishops *do* take into account the ability of modern weapons to precisely attack military targets, but they reject the supposition that this dubious achievement in any way fundamentally changes the nature of nuclear war. They point out that in the Soviet Union, as in the United States, the military installations are not situated in isolated cornfields but are interspersed throughout living and working areas: "The United States Strategic Nuclear Targeting Plan has identified 60 'military' targets within the city of Moscow alone, and . . . forty thousand 'military' targets for nuclear weapons have been identified in the whole of the Soviet Union." The bishops conclude

that whether military bases or cities are targeted, the results to the enemy nation would be almost indistinguishable.

Content

Anderson fails to understand or at least appreciate the peace for which the bishops passionately argue. Such peace can only come from the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. This stand is diametrically opposed to Anderson's articulation of peace: that brought by a militarily strong America which prudently and wisely uses its nuclear arms. Anderson believes that a nuclear war fought by accurate missiles targeted on military installations could remain limited and supposedly won. Surely the bishops would agree that a truly limited nuclear war is much less objectionable than a war fought on the basis of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), a policy which still permeates Pentagon thinking. However, the bishops are not in the business of mapping out nuclear war scenarios—even *limited* nuclear war plans. They deeply sense that "we are the first generation since Genesis with the power to virtually destroy God's creation," and they are compelled to cry out like the prophets of old. Keeping nuclear war limited is a theoretical possibility, but it is far from assured. The bishops decry hanging the fate of humanity on such a chance. In nuclear war, the communication system linking top leadership to field commanders is in severe jeopardy, and a desperate, frightened field officer probably would not err on the conservative side. In sum, Anderson's peace plan is multi-megatons away from that of the bishops.

A lesson Adventists can learn from the challenge of peace, says Anderson, is that they should avoid the politics of nuclear

arms debate because "the job of representing Christian ideals is already being done by laymen—congressmen, journalists, scholars, and military strategists." That's like telling Jeremiah to go home because the landlords in their stone houses know best how to deal with the field hands. Does being a journalist or congressman in a nominally Christian country guarantee inbred Christian ideals? Unless the church clearly and responsibly articulates its lofty principles in the context of modern life's dilemmas, society is the poorer, and in our present modern dilemma, the earth may not continue to exist as we know it.

Throughout their document, the bishops underscore their roles as religious teachers who are compelled to bring the Gospel to bear on "the signs of the time" (the bishops' words). Contra Anderson, I believe Adventists should learn a different lesson from "The Challenge of Peace." If we are true to our longstanding emphasis on the inseparable spiritual-mental-physical-social aspects of human creation, Adventist concern for "present truth" will thrust Adventists along with other Christians into the forefront of today's abolitionist movement. The abolitionist movement of a century ago was not left to politicians and newspapers, but many morally sensitive Christians—including staunch Adventist leaders—spoke out and lived out a decided stand. Slavery was not merely to be made more humane; it was to be obliterated. Nuclear weapons, which hold the human species hostage to the push of a button, must in the name of the earth's Creator be obliterated from the earth.

If Christians at this crucial time in the world's history do not make this cry, who will? If Adventists merely trust in God for future individual salvation (which is surely ours), or trust secular experts to uphold Christian perspectives, we shirk our God-given stewardship of the earth.

James Walters is assistant professor of Christian ethics at Loma Linda University.

Tom Dybdahl Responds

James Walters, Timothy Crosby, and Michael Scofield all made interesting points about my essay, but let me restrict my response to Mr. Walters and Mr. Crosby. First, I'm sorry that the article did not make my position on nuclear weapons clear to Mr. Walters. Because of what Jesus lived and taught, I believe Christians should oppose the building, deployment, and use of nuclear weapons with their voices, their votes, and their money.

But I do have problems with Mr. Walters' argument that Jesus' "pacifist teaching sets a vision of an ideal fully attainable only in the coming kingdom." We are not to wait for heaven before we start loving our enemies; turning the other cheek is not a strategy for dealing with bullies in the New Jerusalem. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus was describing how his followers should behave here and now, and I'm not at all convinced that for Christians to practice self-sacrificing love would mean "calculated mass suicide." The only time it was tried on such a scale—by a non-Christian, Gandhi—it was remarkably successful. There is no telling what God might do for those people who trusted fully in him.

In response to Mr. Crosby, I do not suggest that the state should live by the rules of the church. Quite the contrary: I believe that Christian ethics are for Christians. The behavior Jesus asks for is possible only by miracles of the Holy Spirit. My appeal was for Christians to act like Christians in relating to their government.

I believe there is a permissible use of force by the state, as Romans 13 indicates. But there is also an illegitimate use of force. The difference between a gun in the hand of a policeman and thousands of nuclear bombs in the hands of the state is more than a quantitative one. A gun may kill millions of innocent individuals.

Nowhere in Scripture is there the least

hint that it is proper for the state to kill indiscriminately to protect perceived national interests. It is no coincidence that the Catholic Church, which developed the just war theory, has taken the lead in opposing nuclear weapons. No war with nuclear weapons can be a just war, even for the secular state.

When it comes to nuclear weapons, I am not primarily concerned about a "hypothetical future catastrophe." Nothing is clearer in Christ's teaching than our obligation to feed the hungry and care for the poor, the sick, the homeless. For the richest nation on earth to spend \$285 billion this year on "defense," while millions of people die for lack of basic necessities, seems not simply misguided, but sinful. Believing that, for me to be silent would be to betray my Lord.

Tom Dybdahl works with the Louisiana Coalition on Jails and Prisons.

Eric Anderson Responds

Jim Walters' genial dissent to my essay "The Bishops and Peace" misstates several important issues. I did not urge Adventists to avoid "the politics of the nuclear arms debate" or blindly "trust secular experts." I did question the idea that the moral authority of Christian clergymen makes their political opinions authoritative or that "the church" is ignoring an issue unless the clergy "speak out." In my view, the Catholic bishops did not take seriously enough their own words: "We recognize that the church's teaching authority does not carry the same force when it deals with technical solutions involving particular means as it does when it speaks of principles or ends."

Walters applauds the American bishops because they agree with him. I can similarly praise the French bishops' recent statement ("To Win the Peace"), which defends the morality of the Western nuclear deterrent as a necessary protection against the "dom-

ineering and aggressive ideology of Marxism-Leninism, bent on world conquest," and warns against a sort of "peace" which can be "an invitation to the other party's aggressiveness." But what has been accomplished? Have the two sets of bishops increased the influence of the church? Have they done anything that laypeople were not equally qualified to do?

Although I carefully avoided the emotion-charged issue of whether a nuclear war can be "won," Walters writes as if this is the heart of my argument: peace through wise "utilization" of nukes. Walters ignores two essential points I actually did make. First, "a suicidal all-out superpower exchange may not be the only (or most likely) nuclear danger we need to fear." Second, the United States does not have a credible *deterrent* if our only possible response to any enemy use of nuclear weapons is massive retaliation against enemy civilians. If, as all the evidence indicates, there is no realistic chance for significant cuts in nuclear arsenals in the next 20 years (though a faint chance for some sort of "cap"), then certain prudent conclusions would seem to follow.

Finally, Walters' appeal to the historical example of Adventists and the Abolitionist movement is curious in two ways. I'm

surprised, for one thing, that the 1960s legend of Adventist pioneers engaging in "civil disobedience in devotion to abolition of slavery" still lives on. Surely Walters does not believe that Ellen White's brief reference to the fugitive slave law in 1859 or the unsubstantiated story of John Byington's "underground railroad" activities constitute a vital tradition of civil disobedience. Seventh-day Adventists believed slavery was a great evil, of course, but they had no confidence that this evil could be abolished by political reform. Adventists devoted no time or money to antislavery agitation, and many of them were unwilling even to vote. Jonathan Butler's essay in *The Rise of Adventism* shows all of this clearly.

If we turn to the genuine abolition crusaders, we find another problem. Many of them were hopeful that "moral suasion" and/or peaceful political action could lead to the end of slavery. That is not what happened, of course. For the life of me, I cannot see why a peace advocate would keep reminding us of a wrong that was only corrected by military force.

Eric Anderson is a professor of history at Pacific Union College.

On Spiritual Warfare

Casting Out Demons and Spiritual Revival

by Tim Crosby

The paper produced by the Biblical Research Institute on spiritual warfare, mentioned in Debra Nelson's article on the subject (*Spectrum*, Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 8), seems

to be, on the whole, a balanced document with much needed cautions against very real problems and dangers in the movement. I have had virtually no experience in deliverance ministry (but then, neither did the committee). However, a reading of the paper revealed several questionable conclusions.

First, the committee objected to the reports of extended struggle with the demons lasting for hours, feeling that the