

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Faculty Publications

1-1-1970

Insight

C. Mervyn Maxwell
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/pubs>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maxwell, C. Mervyn, "Insight" (1970). *Faculty Publications*. 3852.
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/pubs/3852>

This Popular Press is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Q. Your response to a question about the Black Manifesto betrays a very slim understanding of the Civil War. Your contention that the Civil War was fought to free Negroes is one of the myths of American history. If you had been keeping up on the histories written during the past half century, you would have learned that the contribution of slavery to the beginnings of the Civil War, while of large importance, was perhaps not the major consideration. Rather political, egocentric sectionalism, and the desire to keep the nation together were of larger consequence.

A. You are quite right in saying that the goal of freeing Negro slaves was not the paramount motive in Northern councils at the beginning of the Civil War. This is a fact so well-known that I took it for granted well-read readers would not accuse me of overlooking it, and my statement does not, in fact, claim that emancipation of the slaves was the only motivation. What I said was: "In the United States Civil War 360,000 Northerners (mostly white, many of them church members) gave their lives for a cause that ended American Negro slavery."

Not all Northerners gave their lives with the primary purpose of saving the Negro. But whether they died to save the Negro or to save the country, the result of their supreme sacrifice was the saving of the Union and the consequent releasing of Negroes from slavery. And whatever may have been the Northern goals when the war began, the release of slaves became an official goal when the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect on January 1, 1863—an event which resulted from intense pressure brought to bear on President

Lincoln by large numbers of antislavery Northern whites.

Q. As a new and interested reader of your remarkable magazine I find that your recent defense of the military chaplaincy poses a pointed question. How can clergymen mingle with troops, encouraging them to believe they are in the right and that the wanton shelling of villages and the torture of enemy soldiers are justified?

A. Some chaplains, I am sure, believe our nation generally has fought not to destroy lives but to save that which makes life worth living—free choice of government, freedom of speech, philosophy, and worship. I have yet to talk with a military chaplain who approves "wanton shelling" and "torture."

In the Army you have two classes of men: those who want to be there and those who don't. The latter class predominates. Should they be deprived of the services of a minister because their nation has called them to fight on its behalf? Should the young soldier gasping away his life from a mortar burst die with the conviction that his church has abandoned him?

Q. You are in grave error when you continually accuse Christian churches of saying that the Ten Commandments are no longer in effect. Every Christian church teaches the Ten Commandments, which we obey as a loving response to the Lord Jesus. They are considered the necessary fruits of faith, and a rule to live by, though not for the purpose of meriting any reward, since we are saved by faith, not works. Our Lord Himself enumerated only seven commandments besides His summation of the Ten Com-

mandments. As the Lord of the Sabbath (Mark 2:27, 28) He had the right to reinterpret the Sabbath commandment. The laws were temporary, to show us how to live until Jesus came, and Paul tells us specifically that the Sabbath laws were blotted out at the cross (Col. 2:14-17) so that now no one is to judge the Christian "in respect of . . . the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Jesus Himself did not command any particular day on which to worship. We believe Jesus is of higher authority than you are, and even higher than any human reasoning.

A. Your long letter, from which I selected for publication only a few sentences, illustrates the dilemma confronting the conscientious Bible-believing Christian. As an earnest Christian you cannot believe that the Ten Commandments have been done away; and yet in the same letter in which you defend them you say that the laws were temporary, the Sabbath has been done away, and that Jesus Himself enumerated only seven commandments.

If Jesus did abrogate three of the Ten Commandments, is your church doing right when it teaches all ten? On the other hand, if you believe that the Ten Commandments are still binding, are you really sure Jesus abolished any of them?

Unquestionably Jesus is the Lord of the Sabbath. Present with His Father as co-Creator at the beginning of the earth, He Himself created the seventh-day Sabbath. (See John 1:1-3; Genesis 2:1-3.)

Other temporary, annual sabbaths were instituted later on, after man had sinned, as part of the sacrificial system and the

ceremonial laws. (Deut. 16.) These sabbaths ("shadows") looked forward to the sacrifice of Christ on the cross (the "body") and came to an end when Jesus died. The seventh-day Sabbath, on the other hand, continues forever as a memorial of God's creative power—as it says in the Ten Commandments, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . and rested the seventh day."

Should not Christians, who love Jesus and believe He gave His life to save us, be willing to obey His commandments and keep His Sabbath holy?

Q. In case of threat of nuclear attack could a congregation in a potential disaster area be forced to leave their church and attend another of a different belief?

A. If bombs ever land on the United States, it is possible—but only speculative at present—that the Government might remand church buildings under its power of eminent domain. My local county civil defense representative has assured me that CD instructions provide no authority for taking over church buildings without permission.

Q. I just read that Andrews University, a Seventh-day Adventist institution, recently accepted Federal funds to operate a special program to train dairy workers. As a faculty member of Andrews, what is your stand?

A. The course trains the otherwise unemployed and is financed under the Manpower Training and Development Act. It was first offered at Andrews in 1968, and thirteen of the first men to complete it were imme-

diately placed in well-paying jobs.

I think we ought to offer this kind of service if we can.

I think we ought to find some other way to pay for it.

I think that, being the school we are, we ought to so perfuse even a dairy workers' course with Christian philosophy that we would know it was a violation of the separation of church and state to accept Federal funds for it.

Q. Your statement regarding Montreal public schools is inaccurate. As a historian and scholar I hope you will inform yourself and your readers. The complex and painful situation presently taking place in Quebec cannot be aided by such circulated misinformation.

Q. I lived for fifty-five years in Canada and would like to say that Canada has a two-school system in which parents may designate whether their money is to go to the public schools or to the separate schools. In Quebec the public schools are Catholic and the separate schools Protestant, but Quebec is only one province. In the other provinces the separate schools are Roman Catholic. I somewhat resent the fact that you left the belief that the exclusion of Jews from public school boards was true for all Canada. It happens to exist only in Quebec, a province which, as you stated, is predominantly Roman Catholic of French background, and there, as you correctly stated, no Protestant (Jews included in this category) can hold a public school board position.

A. The situation I described, one in which three Jews were making a test case over their inability to serve on a public

school board, does apply only to Quebec. In Quebec candidates for public school boards must identify themselves as members of either a Protestant or a Roman Catholic parish. Since Jews can do neither, they cannot serve on public school boards. Neither can atheists, or agnostics, or persons who are not church members. Canada has no First Amendment such as the United States has, and the situation varies from province to province.

In Quebec, Jews have full citizenship rights, except in the matter of sitting on public school boards. The point of my comment in the September-October column was that in spite of the Catholic claim that Americans learned religious freedom from Catholics in colonial Maryland, the fact is that in the province of Quebec, where Catholics have been the majority since colonial times, freedom allotted non-Catholics is curtailed in a highly sensitive area. Loyal Canadians who are disappointed with this state of affairs should take courage and do something about it.

Q. I agree that evolution ought still to be regarded as merely an unproved hypothesis. Would you be able to suggest any recent book that confirms the view that evolution is not an adequate solution?

A. I am happy to recommend CREATION—ACCIDENT OR DESIGN? (Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D.C.), written by my able colleague Dr. Harold G. Coffin, who holds a Ph.D. in paleontology and has carried out considerable field research. The price is \$7.95—for more than 500 pages—and well worth it.