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choosing to have greater faith in obstacles than in God’s ability to overcome them (Numbers 13–14). As the German statesman Konrad Adenauer observed, “We all live under the same sky, but we don’t all have the same horizon.”

What makes the difference between the two attitudes? Both agree that obstacles are real. “For the person of faith, obstacles are temporary because God is real. For the disbeliever, obstacles are permanent because God is not real enough. Thus, the key to exegesis of exigencies is an existential question: Is God real to me? Do I believe, act, and live as if he is alive?”

As God’s people—living, working, and planning within the framework of His “new covenant”—our challenge is not primarily to obtain and deploy adequate financial and human resources. Rather, our first task is to allow the reality of God to enter and transform us individually and corporately. Then His people and institutions will be the head and not the tail. “Failure is not an option.”

NOTES AND REFERENCES
1 Unless otherwise noted, Scripture texts in this article are quoted from The New American Standard Bible.

Box, comment, etc. here?
It’s interesting that in his own unique list of fruits of the spirit, Trogdon settled on the apostle Paul’s usage of the word *charity* to describe our brother in the faith, the hitch-hiker. Though it appears in a book that is otherwise devoid of explicit scriptural allusion, it suggests a somewhat unexpected familiarity with Scripture in someone who, on the surface, shows no apparent espousal of Christianity. But his awareness of the connotations of Paul’s use of *charity* calls for a re-examination of that particular word for those who call themselves Christians.

Most obvious, of course, is the recognition that *charity*, like so many other words in everyday discourse, has become bloated into a caricature of its earlier meanings. Today it is used most frequently to denote some kind of benevolent organization or practice in which is some kind of fuzzy desire to “do something good.”

It’s tempting, sometimes, to suspect that this is what is going on when celebrities become spokespersons for certain causes. Thinking cynically, we can almost hear their promoters saying something like, “You need to select a charity to promote. This will be good for your image!”

But, to be fair, this kind of thinking can be a temptation for anyone. Just write and send a check or slip a couple of extra dollar bills into the mittens of the homeless person for the warm, fuzzy sense of well-being that it can bring to the donor. Sometimes testimonies are shared in which someone says, “helping the unfortunate makes me feel good inside.”

As Trogdon implies, however, “charity’ in Paul’s sense” suggests much more than mere beneficence. The word appears nine times in the King James Version of 1 Corinthians 13, each instance building on the previous reference to a final summary in verse 13: “[T]he greatest of these is charity.”

In most other versions and paraphrases of 1 Corinthians 13, the word *charity*, however, is translated into the word *love*.

It has been observed many times over that love is the central theme for many—too many—of the songs that have ever been written. It has been at the heart of the best, and the worst, poetry. But the writing of 1 Corinthians 13, inspired by the ultimate authority on love Himself, is widely recognized as the very essence of the subject.

And, in the short while they spent together on the road across part of Montana, Trogdon clearly sensed an unmistakable quality in the hitch-hiker’s life, a deep caring for the salvation of others.

“We have an abundance of sermonizing,” Ellen White has written. “What is most needed . . . is love for perishing souls, that love which comes in rich currents from the throne of God. True Christianity diffuses love through the whole being. It touches every vital part, the brain, the heart, the helping hand, the feet, enabling men to stand firmly where God requires them to stand, so that they will not make crooked paths for their feet, lest the lame be turned out of the way. The burning, consuming love of Christ for perishing souls is the life of the whole system of Christianity.”

So, recognizing this kind of love for perishing souls in the hitch-hiker’s life, why didn’t Trogdon simply say he admired his “simplicity, spareness, courage, directness, trust, and [love]”?

The most immediate explanation is probably that the traveling author may have been most familiar with the King James Version of the Bible. This is, after all, the traditional source from which, until very recently, the English-reading culture has drawn most of its understanding of Scripture.

Maybe it is also because he recognized that in everyday street language, the word *love* has become an even more exaggerated caricature of its earlier meaning than has the word *charity*. Maybe it is because his use of certain words is an intentional choice to travel the blue highways of language as well as geography, to avoid the smooth, multilane, interstate highways of superficial usage and the way they separate us with cyclone fences and noise-reducing walls from the land in which we travel.
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