

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Faculty Publications

3-1-1970

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*. 3853.
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/pubs/3853>

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.

insight

Q. You appear to believe the Bible. So do I. You oppose Federal aid to church-related schools because you are afraid of what results may accrue. Don't you know that Jesus said, "Do not be anxious about tomorrow" (Matthew 6:34, R.S.V.)? Parochial schools must get Federal aid in order to survive; so, let's accept it and not worry about the future.

A. If you think church-related schools won't survive without Federal aid, is it possible you are more anxious about the future than I am?

It is my faith that God can impress committed Christians to support their own schools in the future, just as He has in the past.

Q. Your answer to the young man who said that "America's history is rooted in revolution. . . . All our freedoms stem from . . . rebellion" (November-December) was good, very good. It must have taken much study and thought on your part to simplify your answer so and yet still retain its strength. . . . The noisemakers try to tell us that Jesus was a rebel, but I am starting to wonder if Jesus did not come among us at least partly to help us humans find our way back from our wanderings into the often senseless field of rebellion and noisemaking. [Washington]

A. Your interpretation of the ministry of Jesus is right on the mark. Jesus wanted to start a revolution, all right. A revolution that would take us away from the old rut of carping criticism and never-ending grumbling against leadership into an entirely new approach to the problems that surround us—

one of attempting to win men through kindness. His method was often not so much civil disobedience as a kind of doubled-up civil obedience. Said He, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain" (Matthew 5:40, 41).

Q. I would like to add a postscript to the correspondence you have published about blood transfusions. As a nurse I have seen the problem of Jehovah's Witnesses and transfusions. The doctors I have worked with have always tried to get along without transfusions if possible. In severe Rh incompatibility, bad burns, hemorrhages, et cetera, none of the purported substitutes seems to be as good as whole blood. Yet getting a court order, the possibility of a bad medical reaction, and the effect on the child and its family of a transfusion against their will, is pretty sad too.

I would like to make a suggestion that may provide a possible solution in some cases. When I knew once that I was going to have surgery that would in all likelihood require a blood transfusion, I donated a pint of my own blood ten days ahead of time (purely on medical, not religious, grounds) and thus avoided all danger of complications that might have arisen from the use of someone else's blood. [California]

A. Thank you for the suggestion and for pointing out the dilemma of the conscientious doctor who finds himself torn between his respect for convictions of anguished parents on the one hand, and his own concern as a father and physician for a child that he believes will

die if it does not receive a blood transfusion.

Q. I noticed that in establishing the obligation of the Sabbath you stress the seven-day Creation account in Genesis 1. But have you not noticed that Genesis 1 provides only one of two Biblical accounts of Creation? Genesis 1 shows that man and woman were brought into being at the same time, received God's blessing together with the right to the use of earth products, and were instructed to have children. But now, if words mean anything, we find in Genesis 2 a different account. No woman is in the record until an indefinite time after the animals have been made and named, with the result that Creation was not completed on the sixth day but at an indefinite time later on. It is certain, I think, that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 were written by different authors, presenting conflicting points of view.

Other examples of different conflicting accounts occur in the Old Testament. For example, whereas 1 Samuel 17 tells the wonderful story of the boy David slaying Goliath with a slingshot, sad to relate 2 Samuel 21:19 says that Elhanan, one of thirty selected warriors, slew Goliath with his sword. . . . I am in my ninety-eighth year and enjoy corresponding with you. [Ontario]

A. With your sharp mind, at your age, you deserve to hear "the other side" so you can evaluate it.

1 Chronicles 20:5 says that Elhanan slew "Lahmi the brother of Goliath." The omission of these crucial words "Lahmi the brother of" in 2 Samuel 19 is apparently just an error made by

insight

a scribe when copying an ancient manuscript.

You are undoubtedly right in calling Genesis 2 a different account from the one in Genesis 1 "if words mean anything." I ask, however, if Genesis 2 puts the lie to Genesis 1? The interval of time that elapsed between the creation of Adam and that of Eve in Genesis 2 is only time that God needed to make the animals and for Adam to give them names. If we grant that God had the power to create animals in one day as Genesis 1 asserts, why could not Eve have been created on the same day Adam was, but just a few hours later? With God summoning the animals to Adam (Genesis 2:19) and standing at his side to prompt him, it need not have taken very long for Adam to name them all.

My point is, if we let the Bible stand just as it is, it usually proves to be far more intelligible than we may have thought it was at first.

Q. Enclosed please find a clipping from an old newspaper (April 26, 1969) telling of the grass-roots revival of Bible reading in four school districts in Pennsylvania. It quotes a superintendent of schools in Clairton as saying that "the day the Supreme Court banned God was the day that led to moral degeneracy in the country." So many people are in favor of the Bible reading that the American Civil Liberties Union hasn't been able to find any local resident to initiate a case against it. I would like to add my opinion that I think it's a very good thing. It's certainly better than this mandatory religion of "secular humanism" that our unfortunate concept of "separation" has foisted on our public school system. [Michigan]

A. There was an article on this

development published in the September-October, 1969, issue of LIBERTY, so there's little need for me to say much here.

Let me repeat once more that the Supreme Court did not ban voluntary Bible reading and prayer in public schools. It banned only mandatory Bible reading and prescribed prayers.

This being the case, what a pity it is that thousands of children now have been taught that the Supreme Court "banned God." No matter how much good they will get from their Bible reading, what of the harm to their concept of law? If only their parents had been less willing to believe evil of our Government, their children could have retained their Bible reading and their loyalty.

Q. In a recent LIBERTY I read the letter from one of the readers questioning whether Christians can appropriately speak about the second coming of Christ as a solution to the world's needs in view of the fact that two thousand years have passed since He promised to "come back soon." Your answer, mainly that the New Testament which promises the Second Coming also predicted a delay, seemed thoughtful enough to me, but it has left me wondering. What kind of God do we serve if He can make a promise and then not keep it? Is it possible that the time has come when we should admit that the God of the New Testament—whoever He was—didn't really know what He was talking about? I don't want to believe this, you understand.

A. The God of the New Testament not only predicted that Jesus would come again but also (a) warned that there would be "a falling away first" (2 Thes-

salonians 2) and (b) that in consequence God would delay the return of Christ out of love for us: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, . . . but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance (2 Peter 3:9).

Now look at the parable Jesus told in Luke 14. There was a man, He said—a man who represents God—who prepared a great banquet and when it was ready sent out his servants to inform the invited guests: "Come, for all things are now ready." But the guests, incredible as it seems, began to beg off. One had bought a field and wanted to go and see it, another had bought five yoke of oxen and wanted to try them out. God was ready for the banquet but the invited guests, by their refusal to accept it, occasioned a delay.

The wealthy man (God), Jesus went on to say, then said to his servants, "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind." And the servant said, "Sir, what you commanded has been done and still there is room." And the master said to the servant, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come, that my house may be filled."

This God that Jesus talked about, this God of the New Testament and of the Second Coming, has long been ready for Jesus to come again to earth and end our woes. But we who have been invited have delayed Him. And God is not willing to send Christ until more—far more—of us are ready to accept Him, because He doesn't want to save only a few. He wants to have His whole house filled!
Man, what a God!