

AM I MY

BROTHER'S

KEEPER ?

by

JOHN H. COURT, B.A., Ph.D.

Senior Lecturer in Psychology  
Flinders University of South Australia.

The I.V.F. Annual Lecture, Queensland,  
and an Address given at Holy Trinity Church, Adelaide

July, 1973

Published by the  
TRINITY PUBLISHING SOCIETY  
Holy Trinity Church, 87 North Terrace,  
ADELAIDE. SOUTH AUSTRALIA

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10089035 3

I INTRODUCTION

There is a story of a frustrated patient receiving non-directive psychotherapy from a psychologist, who became impatient at his therapist's refusal to answer direct questions. Eventually he burst out, "Why do you always answer a question with a question?", to which he received the bland reply, "Why shouldn't I?"

Our title takes up the first recorded question directed by man to God. Earlier in Genesis 3:1 we read of the serpent's tempting question to Eve: "Hath God said .....?", and in Genesis 3:8 God's first question was that questing one to Adam: "Where art thou?" In the narrative of Cain and Abel we come to man's first question and we at once sense a distance between God and man which has developed. To the Lord's question, "Where is Abel thy brother?", it might have been sufficient to respond, "I know not". He preferred to continue with what reads like truculence: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

In the New Testament, we read the converse of this story. In Luke 10 Jesus responds to the similar question of the Lawyer who, also seeking to justify himself, asks: "And who is my neighbour?" The well-known story of the Good Samaritan gives an antithesis of Cain. Whereas Cain acted against his brother when one might have expected positive regard, the Samaritan acted kindly when there was no apparent reason for him to do so. Whereas Cain took life rather than sacrifice, the Samaritan risked his own life as well as sacrificing his own comforts. The response to Cain was one of reproof: "What hast thou done?", whereas to the Lawyer it was a word of command: "Go, and do thou likewise".

When we put these two stories side by side, it appears clear that the answer to Cain's question is 'yes'. Yet the question deserves a closer look as so many, implicitly or explicitly, give the answer 'no'.

II WHO IS MY BROTHER?

It is essential to establish the scriptural principle that the Christian's involvement is not restricted only to a concern for other Christians. There is a very real sense in which we are

called to go into the world (Mark 16:15), even though we are also called not to be conformed to the world (Romans 12:2). There is a challenge not only to love men's souls, but also to love men in themselves (Anderson, 1968).

This involvement is based not on the doctrine of redemption but of creation. The whole human race is created in God's image and likeness (Genesis 1:26); His concern is both for man and for the material world which, for all our sinfulness, remains under His government and is the object of His love. Consequently, the Biblical principles revealed to man whereby our lives are to be regulated, are intended for the benefit of all men.

To ignore the Biblical principles concerned with the ordering of society, such as those expounded in the Decalogue, can only bring harm, regardless of one's belief in these principles. It is becoming increasingly clear that true freedom is only possible in a setting where such moral constraints are accepted. It is for the Christian to exercise a prophetic role in society, based on revelation, as did the prophets of the Old Testament. Inasfar as we keep God's will for mankind to ourselves, we fail to exercise our responsibility as salt; inasfar as we fail to alert man to his state of need, emotionally and socially as well as spiritually, we fail also to enable him to find that in Christ a solution may be found.

### III HOW FAR SHOULD OUR CARING GO?

No one criticises the collection for charity, the occasional sermon denouncing the evils of society, or the willingness of some to make a life-work of service for others. That way most of us can avoid being involved personally most of the time. There are mixed reactions, however, to the idea that Christians should stand for Parliament, become involved in the media, organise petitions, stage demonstrations or protests or engage in litigation against the promotion of evil. One ready reaction is that while we may have our own views to which we are entitled, we should leave others alone who hold differing views.

It is easy to be lulled into inactivity by that viewpoint because it is so eminently reasonable. If life were a game in which there were no rules and in which the outcome did not matter, one could accept the non-interference plea. But the evils of

society, and the sin in men's hearts cannot be ignored. Triton (1970) says it is the Christian's duty "to let men know that to flout this Creator's law is not merely a matter of opinion or temporary fancy, nor is it merely a question of social convention, but it is basically to rebel against our loving Creator and the way He made us."

How far do we go? Certainly as far as Scripture directs us. Paul in I Timothy 2:1 writes: "I urge that petitions, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be offered for all men: for sovereigns and all in high office, that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in full observance of religion and high standards of morality". When we have fulfilled what appears to be our duty to our brother, Jesus reminds us: "If a man makes you go one mile, go with him two" (Matthew 5:41).

As a result of the energies of Christians of earlier days, we have lived until now in a country where the laws of the land were largely consonant with Christian standards of morality. Under these circumstances the Christian would rarely become involved in the law beyond seeking that it should be enforced. There are major changes occurring in our society calling for serious Christian thought and action in relation to the law.

First, we are seeing laws on the statute books which are being allowed to fall into disuse, or where the interpretation is being altered. This is commonly the prelude to law-reform and consequent loss of protection. The censorship laws are a good example of this. They have been challenged and disputed; now, even while the wording remains the same, those in authority choose to act as though they did not exist. It then becomes easy to repeal the law as it is acknowledged what exists is not working. The potential harm and, indeed, the harm that has already demonstrably occurred through the liberalisation of censorship for political motives over the last 3 years, should be enough for every Christian to be militantly demanding a return to that protection of the young and weak which has always been a feature of the Christian ethic.

Second, we see the further stage of law-reform in many areas of morality, viz. changing or abolition of the law.

It is bad enough to have the theoretical protection of law

overlooked: it is worse when we cannot have the protection of the law. Supposedly in the name of freedom or civil liberties, laws on abortion, homosexuality, drugs, etc., are under attack. We should not be deceived by the appeal to freedom. The Christian knows better than any that true freedom occurs within the law, not without it. He knows that freedom can only be exercised in the context of responsibility. The Bible makes clear that freedom from something only has value if it is also for some purpose. As Dr. Jim Packer writes:

"It means, on the one hand, deliverance from created forces that would keep man from serving and enjoying their Creator, and, on the other hand, the positive happiness of living in fellowship with God under His covenant in the place where He is pleased to manifest Himself and to bless." (1962).

Those who clamour for freedom as a principle commonly forget the wider context in which it must apply. The contemporary psychiatrist, Viktor Frankl, who learned much in a German concentration camp, says:

"Three closely related factors characterise human existence: our spirituality, freedom and responsibility. We have freedom in spite of our instincts, inheritance and environment (contra. the permissives who seek freedom to indulge their instincts) .... Our freedom is not so much a freedom from as a freedom for something, and even a freedom before somebody. We have the potentialities to be swine or saints within ourselves; which one is actualised depends on decisions, not on conditions." (See Darling, 1969).

We do well to note how this is a complete contrast from the freedom supposedly achieved through overcoming repression and inhibition, which would be to give free rein to the instincts. That "permissive" view, derived long ago and inexpertly from Freudian theory, is still sufficiently popular to be worth rejecting outright, as it is perpetuated not because of good evidence, but in spite of it. (Eysenck, 1972).

Third, there are those whose clear goal is to create an alternative society so far removed from Christian principles that

it would be a complete antithesis. They go beyond the point of seeking changes in the law to the abolition of regulations altogether. When the radicals and the revolutionaries were a small dissident group, alien in thought and aims from the rest of the community, one might be excused for minimising their impact on society. Today that is no longer the case and the one who underestimates the radically destructive element in our society is dangerously guilty of being a false prophet who cries "Peace, peace", when there is no peace (Jeremiah 6:14).

There is within our society strong pressure to depart from traditional Christian standards of morality and conduct, not so much due to ignorance or inadvertent misunderstanding, as by an explicit wish to overthrow them. Predictably they find vocal expression in academic circles, but in terms of impact on society, their expression in the abolition of the law by politicians is liable to have far-reaching repercussions in the absence of a Christian corrective. We therefore need to be more thorough in identifying those areas where proposed change or abolition of laws is consistent with Christian insights, and where, on the other hand, we must be active either in retaining existing laws or in supporting sound change. Those Christians who have seen their calling in the law and politics have received less support than they deserved from evangelicals, including those with an academic contribution to make.

How far the Christian should become involved and in what ways has been the subject of a healthy increase in writing by evangelicals in recent years. Guidelines for involvement at personal and collective levels have been extensively discussed by Anderson (1968, 1972) and Triton (1970), having received a major impetus from the recommendations of the Keele Congress in 1967. The recommendations of the Longford Report (1972) are also valuable, and one notes that the Committee included several leading evangelicals. The thoroughly biblical exposition by Barclay (1971) has proved a helpful guide to many. There is a clear consensus that Christians must be active personally and through the forces of law to ensure the preservation of Christian standards, as being best not only for Christians but for all men.

Our responsibility to be involved is clear. James reminds us, "Whoever knows how to do good and doesn't do it, for him it is sin" (James 4:17).

Each generation must identify that area of involvement which is expressive of the needs of the time and tackle it with courage and conviction. In addition, we shall only meet the contemporary challenges with dedication and effectiveness insofar as we grasp the full spiritual perspective of our tasks.

Perhaps because of my own area of professional activity, but I believe for broader reasons also, I would identify the area of ethical and moral standards as a vital one for Christian concern at the present time. Just as Christians have in the past seen the need for good medicine, education and justice, pioneered the abolition of slavery, defended the weak, cared for the orphans, and for that matter continue to be active in many of these areas, so I believe there is currently a challenge to our quality of life in what some call moral pollution. At the level of personal concern for the welfare of our brother, there is ample evidence people are being harmed; that we are allowing exploitation of those groups whom Christians have characteristically protected; viz., women, children and the handicapped.

At a broader level, we see in these assaults on morality a major threat to the family. Attempts to weaken the family, and hence society, through the introduction of pornography are openly admitted by Neville (1970). That this, together with the frequent portrayal of violence in the media, will prove effective in destroying both family and society if allowed to continue unhindered, is becoming increasingly clear.

It is becoming painfully evident that a society with secure and loving relationships is being progressively eroded through the powerful assault on moral and ethical standards provided by the unrestrained diet of violence to which we are exposed through films and television. (Eysenck, 1972).

Such considerations should be sufficient in their own right to arouse the Christian who cares for his brother. The accounts of Cain and of the Good Samaritan both deal with the welfare of others with no direct mention of any spiritual implications in their responsibility. Nonetheless, in asking how far we should go, it would seem the Christian will go further than others would because of the eternal perspective within which earthly problems are to be viewed. Paul reminds us:

"We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Ephesians 6:12).

Rookmaaker (1970), in his analysis of trends in the arts, also underlines the spiritual aspect of his concern at the changes he documents. He and Schaeffer (1968) make the link between pornography and a calculated assault on Christian values which started in subtle ways but is now becoming more explicit (Facijs, 1971).

#### IV WHO IS MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

It may appear self-evident from what has gone before that the call to be our brother's keeper is addressed to Christians. It might also then appear to follow that I am advocating that individual Christians, local congregations, other groups like the I.V.F. as well as the Churches at an official level, should be involved in these areas of welfare and morality.

It is therefore necessary both to restrict and to extend the implications of answering Cain's question. First, there are grounds for believing that Christian involvement should not be such that other responsibilities are overlooked. The local congregation has a responsibility for evangelistic outreach and pastoral care, emanating from the worshipping fellowship. Inter-denominational organisations like I.V.F. have a specific task of evangelism which must take priority. Involvement in related activities must be assessed as to the extent to which they are congruent with this goal. The involvement of the Evangelical Alliance in TEAR Fund and in the Festival of Light indicates clearly that evangelism must not be interpreted too narrowly. Beyond these specifically Christian organisations there appears ample scope for Christians to be widely committed to their responsibility. Michel Quoist (1965), writing in the context of poverty and misery, under the title "You are your brother's keeper", says:

"There is no end to loving others. You may not be 'personally' responsible for the world's poverty and misery, but you are collectively responsible. And collective responsibility necessitates a collective

effort to fulfil that responsibility. Don't think to yourself: I can't do anything about it anyway, because you can do a great deal. Don't dream of doing great things, but be realistic about what you can do in your own circumstances. First and above all, commit yourself, within the context of your own life, to the struggle against injustice through professional organisations, political parties, unions ..... Public opinion is a potent weapon and it must be used to awaken the slumbering consciences of the more fortunate."

The context in which Christians express their social concern must therefore be examined critically. In that sense, we must answer the question restrictively. Not all organisations are equally suited for such involvement even though the individual Christian must recognise an unfailing personal commitment. On the other hand, a more extensive answer is also implicit both in the Cain and Abel incident and in the Good Samaritan parable. It is clear that Abel represents the God-fearing man, while Cain is the man of the world. In the parable, the commendation for brotherly love goes not to the Levite but to the outcast Samaritan. It appears then, that the challenge to responsible involvement extends beyond those of Christian conviction to all men.

It is self-evident that over the centuries men of humanitarian good-will, regardless of Christian commitment, have sensed that call to be one's brother's keeper, most obviously through dedicated service to medicine, education and other helping professions. It is important for evangelicals to recognise the importance of collaboration with men of good-will in the struggle against moral pollution. Because of the closeness of this issue to that of direct evangelism, some have felt that such collaboration would be unscriptural. Granting that the great commission to go and preach the gospel can only be in the hands of the believer, in that purity of message demands a shared conviction, it does not follow that this wider responsibility should be fulfilled in a separated fashion. On the contrary, if it is true that all men are called to be our brothers' keepers, then there should be the closest co-operation. One could expect Christians to exercise the first initiative, as those whose awareness of social evils should be the most sensitised; one could also expect

a more sustained dedication to the task as there is a greater awareness of its spiritual implications; nonetheless, if the Christian ethic is indeed the best for all men, as we believe, then the consequence of Christian initiative will be the mobilisation of those of other faiths, and of none.

It is, in other words, important to emphasise that the primary motivation for social involvement arises from the doctrine of creation, and not from the doctrine of redemption. The responsibility for involvement then rests upon all men. Failure to appreciate the essential nature of this co-operation over moral and ethical issues will lead to the accusation that Christians are seeking to force their own standards on the rest of the community. It is essential to demonstrate that such an accusation is false, and this will be readily achieved as it becomes clear that in fact the large majority of the community fundamentally accepts and desires those standards of Christian morality which have been enshrined in law for centuries.

The Longford Report's (1972) opinion was that

"the Church is entitled to have its view .... but is it entitled to impose this view on others? It is a long time since the Church has been in a position to impose its views. It certainly cannot do so today ... On the one hand, private morals cannot be imposed by law. On the other hand, the law can support morality to which the vast majority agree. Most people want a country where sound morality - in the broadest sense - has public encouragement. So the Christians must gain the broadest measure of public consent by putting the case for Christian morality."

#### V INVOLVEMENT BY THE CHURCH

A concern for the welfare of our brother, in the very widest sense of the term, has been one of the cardinal features of Christian witness throughout the centuries. The exhortation to "Love thy neighbour" had its origins back in the Pentateuch (Leviticus 19:18), but Jesus extended the implications of this law when He taught in Matthew 5:44, "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you ....." This spirit was so clear among the Christians

themselves that they were recognised by the love they showed for one another, but Jesus was the great example for loving to the extent of His own command, when on the Cross He prayed: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do". (Luke 23:34).

There are those who would accuse the Church of irrelevance in contemporary society, of having no message, and failing to come to terms with the evils that surround us. Paradoxically, it seems to be the same voices which are heard where the Church is active, protesting, "Why don't you mind your own business?" One hears the cry that Christians are not concerned enough about poverty, racialism or war, yet when the leaders courageously speak out, as did the Bishops on poverty in Australia last year, the cry becomes "The Church should keep out of politics."

Clearly such protests are the voices of the knockers, who are always displeased at constructive action. Let us not be ashamed of the witness in material terms that Christians have shown over the centuries. Quite apart from the inestimable benefit to the world that has come from sacrificial evangelism in every part, we must record the benefits in terms of medicine, education, government and provision of codes for living which have transformed individuals and nations. When I hear it suggested that we ought to give more for famine relief or do more for the under-privileged, I would agree, but not without saying that the record of Christian witness in all these areas of need remains a living tribute to men of faith and dedication. That the State can move in to so many areas of welfare arises because the foundations were laid in so many cases by Christians acting either individually or collectively. Not only in the past, but equally today, sacrificial service by men and women of God in all walks of life, but especially in missionary contexts, enables us to talk today of human rights and expectations for all which once lay only with the few.

When we hear of those who would criticise, we may justifiably question their motives. Indeed, the paradoxical protests mentioned above suggest that the critics are perhaps touched in their own consciences and, recognising they have a responsibility, seek to project their guilt on to those who put them to shame. Not that I would want to suggest that we can afford to rest smugly in the knowledge that much has been achieved. Rather, I prefer the sentiments of a British dairyman who, when he found

his rival advertising "Our milk comes from contented cows", responded with the slogan, "Our cows are not contented - they constantly strive to do better!"

## VI THE RECORD OF EVANGELICALS

It might be expected that the one who is most zealous for a man's soul would be less concerned for his bodily needs. Indeed, we all recognise the insinuations that have often rested behind mention of the 'social gospel'. Evangelicals in living memory have commonly shunned attention to social concerns, politics and the more secular aspects of daily living in order to be the more assiduous in preaching the gospel - by that, meaning the message of salvation through faith in Christ alone. In many respects we may admire this attachment to orthodoxy, and be thankful that the message of salvation has been clearly proclaimed. Yet I note some paradoxes here too.

First, this division between the spiritual and the bodily needs of man finds no counterpart in the missionary context. Evangelism and social concern must go together. John Stott put it well at the Keswick Convention in 1972:

"Christians should help to arrest this process in society (i.e., the decline in its values and standards) by penetrating it, by being rubbed into it like salt in meat. We should not despise this restraining influence of Christians in the world. It is part of Christ's purpose for His people ..... So do not let us put salt and light, our Christian social and evangelistic responsibilities, over against each other or disparage either. The world needs both. Our Christian vocation is to be both. Jesus Christ said so, and that should be enough."

While the white, middle-class respectable Australian Christian may preach to educated well-filled congregations at home, the picture overseas is utterly different. The pioneer missionary has always been ready to turn his hand to whatever might be needed, recognising that his involvement must be total if he is to be true to his calling.

Second, the divisions between evangelism and social involve-

ment cannot be justified historically. It is one of the glories of the Evangelical Revival in England that the love of God was shed abroad in social interventions that transformed the whole concept of care and concern.

Dr. Sangster put it well in one of his Westminster Sermons:

"How were the slaves freed in the British Empire? Did all England wake up one morning and say 'This is wrong. We must free the slaves.' No! One man woke up one morning with the groan of God in his soul, and William Wilberforce and his friends laboured until that most splendid hour in her history, when Britain was worthy of herself, and under no pressure, save the pressure of her own conscience, paid a larger sum than her national debt to set the slaves free.

How was all the social trouble after the industrial revolution ameliorated? God groaned in the head of Lord Shaftsbury and he toiled and toiled to serve and save the poor. How were the prisons cleaned up in England? Did everybody suddenly say 'These prisons are places of indescribable filth'? No! God groaned in the heart of Thomas Barnardo. Progress is not mechanical. There is no ethical evolution in man alone. Progress is by echo of the groan of God in the hearts of man and woman. And you never need despair for our wayward race while 'the Spirit Himself makes intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered'."

Third, we cannot support a distinction theologically. It might be supposed that the evangelical's concern over salvation could justify a lesser interest in a man's bodily welfare, while conversely the liberal churchman might be the pioneer of social or moral reform. Yet, in practice, it appears that those with the strongest sense of man's sinfulness have also often been most vigorous in seeking his welfare here on earth. Besides those Evangelicals mentioned by Sangster, we may recall the work of General Booth developed by the Salvation Army since 1878.

Social reform has come out of a full appreciation of the doctrine of the Atonement: the sufferings of Christ have been

for many the inspiration to come to grips with the sufferings of mankind. (Foakes-Jackson).

Fourth, we cannot justify the distinction scripturally. I have mentioned John Stott's exposition of salt and light as the two influences we may exert. One need go no further than mention that in the parable concerned with separating the sheep from the goats, we read of those on the king's right hand that they were welcomed because "When I was hungry, you gave me food; when thirsty you gave me drink; when I was a stranger you took me into your home; when naked you clothed me; when I was ill you came to my help; when in prison you visited me". (Matthew 25:35-36). I believe these acts of mercy and concern are commended in their own right, and do not have to be justified as opportunities for evangelism or exercises in pre-evangelism.

If so, then we must ponder seriously the indictment of those who were cast out to whom the king said, "I tell you this; anything you did not do for one of these, however humble, you did not do for me" (Matthew 25:45).

Fifth, the matter is less a matter of black and white than one of emphasis. Traditionally, as the name implies, evangelicals have been identified with evangelism. Yet, just as in the days of Wilberforce, their zeal was also expressed in areas of social need, so too there are indications that today some evangelicals are seeing the need for a wider involvement. Without seeking completeness, one may refer to the TEAR Fund of the Evangelical Alliance, or the work of World Vision in assisting the underprivileged. In the area of moral standards, the Longford Report on Pornography came from a committee including a good number of evangelicals. Clear statements have also been made on issues like abortion and changes in the divorce laws.

Taking these considerations together, we can confidently say that the answer to that question "Am I my brother's keeper?" is affirmative in principle. Yet, in spite of the many examples cited, we may still question whether we go as far as we should in practice.

## VII THE NEGATIVE REPLY

A great reluctance over involvement in the welfare of others

remains common. Few would say outright, "No, I am not my brother's keeper", yet, in practice, the negative response is given in daily living. Quite apart from such shallow reasons as apathy or selfishness, there are some serious issues which bring about resistance.

1. Culturally, in Australia we may note the quality of rugged independence which, rooted initially in a male-dominated society, has been loth to offer care and protection to the less fortunate. In any newly-developing nation it is commonplace to operate socially on a survival of the fittest principle. With increased stability and resources, care for the non-productive members can be increasingly extended, and this is seen in our society as governments provide more and more facilities for the sick, the aged, the young and the handicapped.

2. Economically, however, our provisions lag far behind demand in all these areas. Apparently at a national level our priorities lie elsewhere. Individually, too, we can see the extent of selfish rather than selfless spending in our consumer society which pushes us towards having bigger, newer and more things. The Christian's involvement in this artificially-stimulated demand cycle is something deserving our serious attention. The ecology-conscious younger generation has seen the long-term implications of the trend, and encourages a more spartan attitude to what we think of as necessities but might properly be called luxuries. The extent to which the Christian gives of his money, his time, himself, must not be a function of what is left over when selfish needs have been met.

3. Ideologically, our question poses the greatest problems. The pressure to keep out of the affairs of others has many aspects to it. Such statements as 'mind your own business' or 'let a man go to Hell in his own way if he wants to' receive wide support. (Court, 1972). The more militant advocates of civil liberties urge the removal of legal controls, insisting on almost total freedom of personal choice. The political left-wing expresses its view on censorship by saying that the adult should be free to see, hear or read what he wishes. A proviso is added that others should not be subject to offence by not seeing what they do not wish, and the young people should be protected. The principle sounds worthy, but the provisos make it impracticable, as the current welter of offensive books and films is making

distastefully clear. In fact, the welfare and needs of children are currently being sacrificed by the selfishness of adults.

The Christian could only endorse those principles of unrestricted freedom if man were not so susceptible to corruption, and if those who advocate such freedom were not at the same time paving the way for the corrupters to proceed uninterrupted.

The Christian who takes his concern for others seriously in relation to the morality issues like abortion, pornography, homosexuality or drugs, very quickly comes against the accusation of paternalism. This word has become a term of abuse comparable to 'chauvinist' or 'wouser'. Yet, as a colleague of mine has remarked, "paternalism is not always a vice; it can sometimes be a virtue - especially in cases of paternity".

This concept is significant in terms of our title "Am I my brother's keeper?" It is as we seek to fulfil our role as brother that we are criticised. That is, fraternalism is thought to be paternalism. We can all recognise the sense in which a father exercises care and responsibility for his children which involves discipline and control along with love. We could reasonably be attacked if we seek to behave to the non-Christian in that way. God alone has that prerogative to all of us, His children. Our critics may reasonably ask, "Who are you to make decisions on my behalf?"

Part of our problem then arises in the non-Christian failing to grasp the extensive demands of fraternalism or brotherly love. Without a sense of relatedness, without sense of responsibility for others and with egocentricity and hedonism on the increase, the non-Christian finds it abhorrent that one person should care unreservedly for the welfare of another. Inevitably he looks for the pay-off and assumes that concern for others must either be for financial reward or due to some hang-up. Simply to care on the basis of brotherly love is difficult to grasp.

The other part of the problem lies with the Christian who also may fail to grasp the size of his responsibility or its nature. It is out of the paternal love of God to which we have first responded that we can then show this love to others, even the unlovely. Then we properly meet the question: "Who are you to decide for me?" by making clear that we do not seek to impose

our own opinions: we are commissioned to proclaim the will of God to all men.

To finish we may return to one more contrast in the stories of Cain and the Good Samaritan. To Cain's question, God replied accusingly, "What hast thou done?" By contrast, Jesus' command to the Lawyer following the parable of the Good Samaritan was "Go, and do thou likewise."

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.N.D. (1968) Into the World, London, Falcoln Books
- Anderson, J.N.D. (1972) Morality, Law and Grace, London, Tyndale Press
- Barclay, W. (1971) Ethics in a Permissive Society, Collins, Fontana Books
- Court, J.H. (1972) The Function of the Christian within the realm of the ongoing power struggle. Lutheran Theological Journal, 6, 95-104
- Darling, H. (1969) Man in His Right Mind, Paternoster Press
- Eysenck, H.J. (1972) Psychology is about People, Harmondsworth, Penguin
- Facius, J. (1971) The Little White Book, White Book Publications
- Foakes-Jackson, F.J. Quoted in Henry, C. (1957) Christian Personal Ethics, Michigan, Eerdmann
- Longford, Lord (1972) Pornography: The Longford Report, London Coronet Books
- Neville, R. (1970) cited in Longford, page 177
- Packer, J. (1962) In Douglas, J.D. The New Bible Dictionary, London, I.V.F.
- Quoist, M. (1965) The Christian Response, Notre Dame, Logos Books
- Rookmaaker (1970) Modern Art and the Death of a Culture London, I.V.P.
- Sangster, W. (1970) Daily Readings, (Ed. F. Cumbers) London, Epworth Press
- Schaeffer, F. (1968) Escape from Reason, London, I.V.F.
- Triton, A.N. (1970) Whose World? London, I.V.P.

#### OTHER GREAT BOOKS by JOHN COURT:

##### CHANGING COMMUNITY STANDARDS: (OP 8 - \$1.00)

By what criterion do we assess what is acceptable to the community? What responsibility is in the hands of those we elect to govern us? Dr. Court asserts that the Australian community has been betrayed by some of our politicians who have chosen to lower moral standards irrespective of what is right or desirable.

##### HOMOSEXUALITY: (B8 - 10¢)

Dr. Court, a Christian psychologist, gives a trustworthy assessment of this difficult problem.

##### IN DEFENCE of CENSORSHIP: (B10 - 10¢)

"Freedom of the Press" is quite satisfactory while editors maintain integrity. But we fallible human beings need effective censorship for the good of all.

BUILD for CHRISTIAN MATURITY  
with literature from the

TRINITY PUBLISHING SOCIETY

87 North Terrace,

ADELAIDE. SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

There is a big gap in our responsibility to our fellows if we limit our care to the usual social welfare activities.

Dr. Court urges Christians to accept their God-given responsibility to care for their fellow citizens' moral and spiritual welfare also, by combating evil and promoting all that is good and sound and clean.

Recommended price: 20¢

Another hard-hitting challenge by Dr. Court:

STAND UP and BE COUNTED: (OP 18 - \$1.00)

This volume paves the way for the October 1973 Festival of Light.

Dr. Court insists that the only way for good to win in our present society is for the silent majority who desire good to become more vocal about it.