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ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF PERSONAL SALVATION IN THE THEOLOGY OF NORTH AMERICAN EVANGELICALISM:
ON THE ROAD TO A THEOLOGY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

by

Robert F.J. Gmeindl

The question under consideration is the effect of the belief in personal salvation on the theology of North American Evangelicalism, for the purpose of developing a theology of social justice.

This study is a preliminary investigation of the history of Evangelical individualism and the potential influence that individualism might have on Evangelical theology. Certain trends toward isolation and separation, as well as a tendency to neglect what I have called systemic evil, are examined to see how they may result from the Evangelical stress on individualism. Also presented is a skeletal outline of Marcuse's analysis of one-dimensional society in order to clarify the power and influence of systemic evil. Finally, these observations are applied to C.F.H. Henry's book Aspects of Christian Social Ethics, to analyze how his theology manifests those trends and to examine the power of individualism in North American Evangelical theology.

It was found that a belief in individualism as expressed by the theology of personal salvation may lead Evangelicalism into isolation and separation, and it might
also pressure Evangelicalism into neglecting the corruption in society.

The primary conclusions of the study are that to attempt to found a social theology on North American Evangelicalism's belief in personal salvation, as some have tried to do, is to cater to isolation and separation from society. Also, one may be persuaded to accept the very society that a social theology must be designed to change. Thus a more corporately oriented approach should be found, upon which to begin building a social theology. One suggested alternative is to view social problems and issues from within the dynamic tension between the social strategies of revolution, reformation, regeneration and revaluation.
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INTRODUCTION

According to a 1979 poll commissioned by Christianity Today, thirty-one million Americans are evangelicals. (1) That is, thirty-one million Americans believe that Jesus Christ is the divine Son of God; that the only hope for salvation is through personal faith in Jesus Christ; that the Bible is the Word of God and is infallible in its statements and teachings. These thirty-one million U.S. citizens read the Bible and attend religious services at least once a month. (2) The poll also suggested that over forty-five percent of the nation's population, almost one hundred million Americans, believe that "...the only hope for heaven is through personal faith in Jesus Christ." (3)

Evangelicalism is the second largest religious movement in the United States, second only to Roman Catholicism, and its influence so permeates modern America that it has been called "...the most significant—and overlooked—religious phenomenon of the '70s...." (4) The nomination and subsequent election of Jimmy Carter, a personally proclaimed evangelical, to the presidency of the United States has served to focus attention on this movement and its influence.
However, Evangelicalism was in America long before the media and the politicians discovered it in the 1970s. It can be said that American Evangelicalism began with the formation of the modern American nation, and that it embodies some of the most deeply-rooted traditions and characteristic attitudes in American culture. Evangelicalism, in many ways, represents America in the religious community and has taken on a special American meaning. American Evangelicalism is not European evangelicalism, where the term 'evangelical' is normally used to refer to the state Protestant church, but represents a particular manner of interpreting Christianity, a manner which exhibits a certain style or mood of belief and implies a type of doctrinal and experiential content.

One of the important distinguishing features of North American Evangelicalism is its emphasis on individualism. This stress on individualism is in harmony with that conception of individualism which seems to lie at the foundation of Western understanding and in the forefront of American secular philosophy. It is this conception which is the general concern of this work. How is this individualism expressed and propagated? Where does it find its religious roots and how does it influence the subsequent theology of the North American Evangelical? Some of these questions will be answered in the chapters which follow,
along with an analysis of the social effects of that expression and propagation.

In order to understand why these and subsequent questions are of concern to me, it may be helpful to present a short introduction to the personal journey that has brought me to this examination. For the first seventeen years of my life religion, as such, played little or no part in my education. As with most Canadian school children of the fifties and early sixties, I learned the Lord's Prayer through repetition at the beginning of each school day. Beyond this piece of memory work little was done to forward my religious education. My family was strictly agnostic and churchly religion never had a part in our family life.

It was not until my last year in high school, around the age of seventeen, that I was first confronted directly with a challenge to begin to take religion more seriously. Some of my friends that year became involved in the operation of a Christian coffee house designed to approach students with their message of Christianity. In that atmosphere I began my interaction with Christianity, a dialogue which eventually led to my acceptance of the Christian faith.

At first the conversation was confined to an intellectual discussion on the existence and purpose of God. I had never denied the existence of God, but neither had I
taken the time to affirm it. Through the coffee house dialogue I was challenged to do so in the particularly Evangelical way of accepting Jesus Christ as my personal saviour. It was this challenge that became the focus of the continuing discussion. I felt clearly that I must accept the existence of God and that that acceptance should be in a certain context, but it seemed that the Evangelical context was too restrictive. Much more to my liking was what I began to call 'theism,' that is, a belief that God existed and that He operated in the affairs of men through many agents. This became the platform from which I hurled my bolts of criticism against Christianity. The discussion began to center more and more on the need for a personal salvation experience, an experience shared by those with whom I was in discussion. Each of them seemed to have found, in the Christianity they were offering, a peace and fulfillment greater than my own. The power of this began to wear on me and on my position until one day, while riding a public bus, I too accepted this Jesus into my life. There were no bells, no angelic trumpets, no blinding light, only a peace that comes with decision. I had finally resolved the problem within myself.

With that decision, made on the bus, I began the long road of Christianity which I now travel. My friends helped me to understand the meaning of my experience; the Bible
became my regular reading and Christian fellowship my constant need. I became involved in all of the current Christian activities. I attached myself to a Christian drop-in center whose purpose it was to evangelize the youth of Kitchener. Shortly thereafter, I experienced the charismatic experience of the second baptism, the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I spoke in tongues and, in general, experienced the spectrum of emotion that was at that time associated with the 'Jesus Movement.' I knew myself to be saved and did all in my power to bring that message of salvation to others, with some success. In all, I became a classic North American evangelical youth and followed the banner of the Jesus people.

However, all was not well in Eden, for as I continued my growth and pilgrimage through the Christian evangelical world, doubt began to rear its head. I had always been a rather critical thinker, allowing little of the common intellectual theory to go by uncriticized. This same critical approach began to reflect itself in my newly found Christianity. In concert with this I began to read some rather unconventional Christian material. Questions of social justice and social change had always fascinated me, and as I continued to read socially concerned literature, my own newly accepted faith began to reveal certain inadequacies. It was clear that I had found my own personal
salvation in Jesus Christ, and I now offered it to others. But this faith seemed wholly inadequate when it came to addressing the injustice that I saw in the world. Most of my acquaintances tended to neglect social questions, somehow content in the knowledge that as long as they brought a man salvation, they had fulfilled the biblical injunctions. I found that I couldn't share in this contentment. I found myself looking for ways to integrate the need I saw for social justice with the Christianity I had come to know.

My biblical study, which, until this time, had been concentrated in the New Testament, began to lean more toward Old Testament reading. I began to find myself quoting more from the Old Testament than the New, and, in that, I started to realize that there was more to Christianity than just a message of personal salvation. My Old Testament reading led me to concentrate more on communal and holistic approaches to religion as my individualistic emphases became less and less viable in the social world in which I lived. I began to sever some of my ties with the Christian community which I saw as too concerned with salvation and not properly concerned with social justice. I found other Christians of a like mind, Christians who also saw the question of social justice as one of importance. It also became more precise, through reading and discussion, that I needed a clearer definition of social justice if I was to further my concern.
This definition I found in the Old Testament and is reproduced in the next chapter of this study.

As my Old Testament reading increased I also amplified my reading of Jewish Old Testament scholars. Particularly influential at this time were the writings of Martin Buber. Buber offered a new definition of salvation, a definition which directly contradicted the conception of deliverance I had espoused to that time. According to Buber the redemption offered by God to His creation was a salvation which would redeem all of mankind. It was God's will that he consummate all of His creation and restore all in need of redemption. It was not God's intention to separate his creation into the traditional evangelical camps of saved and damned, a polarization which I had to this point accepted. Buber contended that God would save all those in need of salvation and that this salvation would be completed through the outworking of God's plan of redemption.

As I read Buber and the Old Testament, this view of salvation began to take on more authority for me. My allegiance to the conception of personal salvation began to waver as the authority of the Old Testament and the obvious scholarship of Buber began to construct a case against it. It was at this time that I began to read the work of Nicholas Berdyaev, a theologian of the Christian faith who championed this conception of universal salvation.
Berdyaev's critique of Christian salvation found its focus in the Western emphasis of individualism. His theological work led him to state categorically:

We cannot be saved, one by one: isolated salvation is impossible. We may be saved only with our neighbour, with other people and with the world. (11)

This statement, put so boldly, seemed a direct attack on the Christian faith which I had come to proclaim. The very foundations of my faith were rocked by his words. Shadows of doubt began to appear more substantial, and unformed suspicions began to take clearer shape as my theology tried to wrestle with the new concepts he was presenting. Questions began to form as this tension increased. From where had my original definition of salvation as individual come? Was it possible that the North American religious community, a community whose foundation was the individual view of salvation, had for so many decades approached Christianity from an incorrect perspective? If this individualism was not biblically mandated, as Berdyaev implied, what were its origins?

The answer to this last question was not long in coming. It was Berdyaev's contention that the individualistic view of salvation which dominated Western Christianity, was a manifestation of the prevalent
selfishness in Western culture. To so concentrate on individual, personalistic salvation was, to Berdyaev's thinking, "...monstrously selfish,...egoistic and self-conceited..." and indicated a morbid separation between man and his world.(12)

I found this selfishness to be very much alive in my own theology and in the theology of my Christian community. I began to remember the joy I felt that I was no longer damned, the selfish concentration on personal assurance which characterized my earlier theology. I also began to see manifestations of that selfishness in the theology of North American Evangelicals, the seeming disregard for social injustice, the jealous defense of the right to the fruits of salvation and the studied contempt directed against those who, once being offered the message of personal salvation, rejected it. I saw men who happily arranged their personal religious life with little or no concern for their responsibility to the larger community.(13) I saw sects within Christianity whose theology proclaimed their belief that their alone partook of the love and compassion of God and who callously, seemingly without thought, consigned billions of human beings to the eternal fires of damnation.(14) It seemed to me that Berdyaev had a point and that serious consideration had to be given to his critique of individual salvation and to his theology of universal salvation.(15)
But it is not so easy to deny a belief that has conditioned the major portion of one's Christian life. I found that although the arguments of Buber and Berdyaev moved me deeply and challenged me, I could not carelessly discard my Evangelical conception of individual salvation. Admittedly Berdyaev's arguments made it difficult to espouse individual salvation. Old Testament reading and study seemed to agree more with the corporate view than the individual view, and even the New Testament began to sound more corporate, but it was still difficult to shake my conditioning.

The final break came when I began to read the New Testament from the corporate perspective. Texts which had stood as bulwarks of the individualistic approach began to take on new meanings for me. Jesus' proclamation "I am the way, the truth and the light, no one comes to the Father but by me" ( John 14:6 ), once the mainstay of my evangelical witness to personal salvation, now whispered of a different interpretation. Jesus may have been saying that by His atonement and through the power given him by the Father, He was the instrument by which all of creation will come to redemption. This new interpretation seemed more in line with the theological hermeneutic of Berdyaev. As I reread the Gospels in light of this new hermeneutic I found it to be helpful and consistent. The potential for a corporate
theology became more evident, and a tangible link with the corporate nature of the Old Testament started to develop. However, my reading of Paul and his letters posed a greater difficulty.

It seemed that Paul's theology was one founded in individualism and thus supportive of the individualist position of traditional Evangelicalism. Particularly important was to interpret Paul's claim to the Romans that salvation was by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. (Rom. 3:22f) The corporate hermeneutic could interpret the grace of God as that will to redeem His whole creation; however it failed to confront the individual implications of "faith in Jesus Christ." Further New Testament reading began to provide an insight which allowed for the more corporate interpretation of even that phrase. Of particular help was the text "Every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." (Phpp. 2:10-11) which could be interpreted collectively, namely that the faith in Christ spoken of by Paul meant a corporate faith and that all of mankind would be saved by grace through its corporate faith in the atonement of Jesus Christ.

These potential interpretations, while not claiming absolute authority or truth, began to convince me that the possibilities I had begun to see in Buber and found more
clearly articulated in Berdyaev showed some promise. They were alternative interpretations of the New Testament that could be applied consistently to the whole of the Scripture. While not proving that the belief of individual salvation was false, the corporate view that I was examining did pose serious questions about the way in which the North American Evangelicalism I had come to know, interpreted the Scripture.

It seemed to me that the other point in favour of the corporate view of salvation was its inherent concern for the world and its injustice. It seemed that by approaching the problem of social justice from the point of view of corporate responsibility, Berdyaev's Christianity took seriously the social problems and concerns that had first begun the questioning of my religious tradition. I had begun that journey with the realization that the Christianity I knew did little to help me to deal with social problems. Certainly it dealt with my personal sin but it seemed to lack any coherent theology that could deal practically with the injustice which appeared to control the world. Corporate theology, on the other hand, proclaimed that my salvation was not contingent on a one to one experience with God but on the grace of God which He could dispense as he would. The emphasis of corporate theology was not on salvation but on the continuing justice of my
relationships with my fellow man. Because mankind was to be viewed as a corporate whole whose salvation was in the hands of God, priority could be given to social responsibility. This new Christianity I saw was one of social concern, one which concentrated on the redemption of society and faced the problem of social justice head on. Where Evangelical theology had seemed to concentrate on snatching a lucky few out of the damned world, corporate theology seemed intent on proclaiming the salvation of all creation without exception. This second approach seemed more in line with what I had come to recognize as the compassionate concern of God for His creation. My battle was ending. I had found a theology that allowed me to proclaim both salvation and social justice, a salvation for all and justice for the whole.

This is now where I find myself, on the first few faltering steps of the path of corporate understanding. It is from this place that I now look back at my Evangelical beginnings and initiate a critical examination of its individualist theology. I have walked its paths and have felt secure. Now I stand in another place, different from it but related to it. Yet many of those who travelled that road with me continue to proclaim the Evangelical position. Many continue to neglect the problems in society which have come to possess me. Most have not come to my conclusions. Why?
It seems that in the theology of the evangelical there exists a pressure to minimize the social condition and its claim on Christianity. It seems that by concentrating on individual salvation, the evangelical is pressured to neglect social injustice in favour of saving a few out of an obviously damned world. Social concerns seem to hold a lesser priority than the mission of personal salvation. It will be my concern in this study to show how the dynamics of the Evangelical position on salvation militate against social action on the part of its adherents. I will demonstrate further that this concentration on individual salvation leads the North American Evangelical to ignore social conditions, to move toward isolation and separation from social realities and to hunger for an assurance of salvation which isolates him or her further from the world.

I will also try to show that by approaching the question of salvation from an individualistic perspective, the Evangelical is led to neglect the evil in society and even to defend it. This examination will consist of an exploration of systemic evil, that is, the evil inherent in a system above and beyond the sum of the individual evils that make up the system. My purpose will be to show that the corporate structures of today's society manipulate and dominate man and that most Evangelicals tend to disregard this evil when they proclaim their social witness. In
conjunction with this I will furnish an analysis of Carl F.H. Henry's work in the area of Evangelical social ethics and try to illustrate how this disregard manifests itself in his theology. Henry has been acknowledged, both by scholars and the popular media, to be a leader in the Evangelical movement and a worthy spokesman for it(17), and for that reason he will be the focus of that particular analysis.

Lastly I will summarize my examination and point out where I see the major obstructions to Evangelical social action. In this way I hope to describe the Evangelical journey and its direction critically, and also provide a cautious warning to those who now travel the Evangelical path.
CHAPTER ONE: Some Definitions

It was during my religious journey that two theological subjects began to dominate my thinking, the question of salvation and the question of social justice. The Evangelical theology of salvation was the first to challenge me to take seriously the message of Christianity. Its challenge drew me out of an unconcerned agnosticism through an uncertain 'theism' to a personal profession of the truth of Christ. It served to form and mold my early faith, providing me with an assurance of paradise, with the security that comes with saving knowledge and with a message I could bring to the non-Christians around me. Through the North American Evangelical message of salvation I was introduced to the whole spectrum of Christian emotion and concern, and it was against this conception of salvation that I finally began to rebel as my religious growth required me to give greater consideration to the questions of social justice.

As stated in the introduction, the first seeds of doubt began to grow when I introduced the concerns of social justice to my theology of salvation. Inadequacies in my salvation theology began to appear as I tried to apply them to the social concerns which clamored for resolution. The
answers offered by this salvation theology seemed incomplete and did not provide practical answers to the plethora of social injustices that called out for action. As I came to formulate my ideas concerning social justice, the deficiencies in the Evangelical theology of salvation became clearer. Of particular concern was the seemingly inordinate emphasis on the personal and individual in the Evangelical theology. This seemed to come into direct conflict with the more corporate concerns of social justice questions, a conflict which became more acute as my investigations progressed.

Perhaps it would be helpful at this time to review the definitions that precipitated this tension. In this way it may become clearer how it is that this strain came about and why I am presently involved in the examination of the North American Evangelical theology of salvation.

The fundamental assumption of North American Evangelicalism is that man is a fallen creature who, having been created in the spirit and image of God, has at one time in his history rejected that spirit. It is the contention of most Evangelicals that man has sinned, transgressed against God's explicit wish or instruction, and has for that reason fallen from his original state of grace. (1) This fall is universal. (2) Doctrinally it might be said, in more or less the following way:
That all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and that repentence is commanded of God for all and necessary for forgiveness of sins. (3)

As can be seen, not only is man considered to be fallen, "...short of the glory of God," but he must also repent and seek forgiveness for those sins. (4)

This repentance and forgiveness provide the second doctrinal step in this definition of salvation. Inherent in the call to repentance is the threat or promise that some evil consequence is attendant to man's sin. This consequence is normally encompassed in the antithesis to heaven, hell. It is in hell that the unsaved, unrepentent sinner will be lodged, where he will suffer the agony of being without God. With this as the proposed consequence of man's sinful and fallen nature it becomes necessary to provide an alternative which will to one degree or another avoid hell and its attendant agony. This alternative is salvation, literally to save from death as a sinner.

Yet salvation in the doctrine of most Evangelicals is more than the mere avoidance of hell, it is also the present healing and preserving of fallen man. It can thus be said that salvation is not only a doctrine of afterlife but also one which provides for the victory over the temptations of sin in the here and now. A third aspect of the
evangelical's doctrine of salvation is that of legal justification. (5) A part of the original conception of man's fallen state was that man had, by his disobedience and rejection of God, acted illegally and had offended God's need for justice. It is necessary, therefore, that the salvation of man also encompass some legal remedy for his illegal action of disobedience.

The three aspects of the Evangelical's doctrine of salvation are summed up adequately by Everett F. Harrison in the "Baker's Dictionary of Theology" where it is said that salvation involves:

...three ideas. (1) Justification. Man must be freed from the just punishment which God's judicial sentiment requires so that he may without fear be reconciled to God, but in such a way that God may still be just in His justifying or saving action... (2) Temporal Victory. Victory over evil was promised through the "seed of the woman"... It was accomplished by the Holy Spirit working in Old Testament leaders.... Finally, in the church age, Christ sends the holy spirit to work in and through the church so that believers work out their own victory over evil. (3) Final Deliverance and blessing. Christ will come a second time to deal finally with evil powers and the consequences of sin;...(6)

As important as the doctrine of salvation is for the Evangelical, of equal importance is the method of salvation. Without some examination of this method, a definition of the
term "salvation" would be hopelessly incomplete. Salvation is both a noun and a verb, both a name for something and an action to something. The method of salvation is the definition of the verb "to save."

In my experience, Evangelicals tend to see methods of salvation fitting into three broad categories: (1) sacrificial ritual, (2) works righteousness and (3) God's grace. These Evangelicals saw the first two methods relying on the actions of men to satisfy a wronged God, while the third was seen to rely on God to act to satisfy this perceived wrong.

Sacrificial rituals have tended to accompany man's most primitive attempts at satisfying an angry God. Sacrifices have ranged from crops grown or gathered to animals raised or trapped to humans offered or captured for the purpose. The basic logic was that by offering the angry God a portion of the fruits of the earth, his wrath would be satisfied, and man could once more live in harmony with his creator. Man provided the sacrifice and God, in his grace, deigned to accept it as appropriate payment for man's transgression.

Another method of salvation which has been proposed finds close ties with the sacrificial ritual. The method known as "works righteousness" tends to view salvation as the giving of one's actions or life to satisfy a wronged
God. It is believed that by tailoring one’s actions to a certain pre-defined set of rules man can satisfy God’s need for legal remedy. In this way man is urged to love the holy life, doing only good and avoiding the practice of evil. The degree to which man succeeds in this attempt is the evidence upon which his worthiness for salvation will be measured. Put in a crude way, God is a clerk who watches man’s actions, recording his good and bad deeds, and having done so, weighs them against His standard in order to pronounce man saved or damned.

The Evangelical tends to see in both the sacrificial ritual and the works righteousness a method of salvation which presents man as the primary motivator. Both are seen to present man with a task to perform and then look to God to decide on the acceptability of the performance. Neither denies God the final judgement yet both imply that as long as the act measures up to a certain standard the final, positive judgement is virtually assured.

The third method of salvation, God’s grace, seems to reverse that action. The third method of salvation also tends to be that method which is accepted doctrinally by the majority of Evangelicals, at least, if one is to assess them by their rhetoric. In this schema God is seen as the prime mover in the saving of man, and it is God’s action alone which will save.(7) Most Evangelicals have defined this
saving action as the "salvation event" and tie it inextricably with the life and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Through Christ crucified, Christians have found peace with God: they have tasted the joy of forgiveness for past sin: they have received new life and strength for the future.(8)

According to most Evangelicals the act of salvation was accomplished when God sent His only Son to earth to live the human life perfectly and then to die, still perfect, upon a Roman cross and thus to sacrifice himself to satisfy the requirements of divine justice.(9) Whereas in the first two methods of salvation man initiated the process, in this method God sets the wheels in motion. Man partakes in this action only passively as he accepts the saving act for his own. Thus it has been said by the Evangelical that salvation is only by God's grace and not through any action on man's part. This doctrine was clearly expressed by the magisterial reformers of the sixteenth century.

Salvation then can be defined as God's act to save mankind from the consequences of his rejection of the original state. In some cases it can be the legal recompense for acts of sin which otherwise would require man's damnation and exile away from God's presence. It is the act which allows man to resist temptation successfully and to live a life which is acceptable in the eyes of God.
All of this was brought about through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ on the cross or to put it another way:

The purpose of the miraculous incarnation of the Son of God was that He might become the Mediator between God and men, both fulfilling the divine law and suffering and dying in the place of mankind. In this manner God has reconciled the whole sinful world unto Himself. (10)

For the Evangelical there is yet another point that must be made about salvation, that it begins with the individual and that its major focus is on the individual. Robert J. Coleman in his work on the continuing dialogue between the Evangelical and the Christian Liberal, points out that:

For the evangelical, salvation begins with a commitment to Christ growing out of a radical transformation of life. The primary task of the Christian is to bring other men into this saving relationship with Jesus. The function of the church is not to Christianize social structures but to nourish the members of Christ's body with God's Word and the sacraments. In both cases priority is given to man's spiritual needs, because a man must be changed spiritually before he is changed at all (John 3:1-15). Man's eternal welfare must always take precedence over his temporal needs. Reconciling men to God is the first order of priority before men can be reconciled to men. (11)

The Evangelical's heritage stresses three major points, a living faith in a personal saviour, an individual witness of the effect of Jesus Christ in their lives and the
belief that this personal, individual view is both biblical and the essence of orthodox Christianity. (12) This emphasis on individualism finds expression in the pronouncements of all major evangelical spokesmen, from C.F.H. Henry, one of their noted scholars (13), to Billy Graham their most successful evangelist. (14) The individual is all important. He or she is given dignity and worth by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and when Christ calls to man he calls the individual out from the group to stand alone before God in a personal confrontation. In this way Jesus restores to a human being his or her personal identity. (15) It is the perceived function of religion to bring the person to that point where he or she is required to make a personal decision for or against Jesus and then to experience intensely and subjectively His presence and power. (16)

Having made this decision for Christ, the individual has begun to walk the narrow way, with Jesus as saviour giving him or her that joy, peace and security which can be found only in Him. (17) In this way man is brought to experience the conversion and the 'new birth' that is his or her greatest need. (18)

For Evangelicalism, this individual experience of Christ, this personal encounter with God which results in the conversion or 'new birth' is the very essence of
salvation. "Evangelicalism is above all an individualizing faith which puts getting a person right with God absolutely first."(19) This point is particularly crucial to any understanding of the Evangelical theology and to give it less than top priority is to misapprehend its power and its intrinsic necessity. In light of the importance of this point, I will take some time in the next chapter tracing its influence and historical roots.

It is this individualist emphasis which will be critiqued in the following chapters with particular concern for some of its implications for Evangelical attempts at social action. What pressures does this stress on individualism place on Evangelicals as they contemplate social action? Does it help or hinder their social concern and does it provide a conducive atmosphere for actions of social justice?

Along with my misgivings about the individualist emphasis in my Evangelical heritage, there was a growing need to deal concretely with problems of social justice. I began to ask: what is social justice and how do I implement it in light of my present theological position? In order to answer the first question, that of definition, I began to look for supportive material for a belief already held.
The definition of social justice I present here is the result of Old Testament work and my reading of Old Testament scholars. It is not presented as a definition that is acceptable to the North American Evangelical because it is unlikely that the Evangelical would accept more than its most secondary suggestions. It is offered so the reader might more clearly understand the tension that developed in my theology when I introduced this definition to my own Evangelical theology of salvation. This definition of social justice compelled me to question and reinterpret my earlier definitions of salvation and in turn obliged me to critically re-examine those definitions.

Although in common use in today's church circles, the term 'social justice' still begs for definitional clarity. Our primarily Western-oriented, Greek-based society tends to define "justice" as Aristotle did: "...justice is the habit whereby a person with a lasting and constant will renders to each his due."(20) Social justice then becomes an extension of this definition as society is seen as the agent whereby "each is given his due." Justice is seen as an attempt to ensure some equitable basis for action using the principle of "due," that is, what each deserves. This is the meaning of social justice which has tended to dominate Western thinking with respect to justice.
There is, however, an interpretation which does not root itself in the Aristotelian conception of justice. This definition is Semitic in origin and finds its major expression in the books of the Hebraic scriptures.

Justice is not an ancient custom, a human convention, a value, but a transcendent demand, freighted with divine concern. It is not only a relationship between man and man, but an act involving God, a divine need. Justice is His line, righteousness His plummet (Isa. 28:17). It is not one of His ways, but in all His ways. Its validity is not only universal, but also eternal, independent of will and experience. (21)

Important in the above statement are two points, first that justice is not merely an act which involves two people but a relationship which by its nature involves God in the action. In this way justice, and its companion social justice, are elevated from the base line of human expectation and need to the moral realm of divine need. It is suggested that social justice is not only a possible action but a necessary action if one is to emulate God in one's life of faith.

The second point of importance is that social justice is defined as being eternal and universal and is said to be independent of will and experience. Where Aristotle views the act of justice as one which is dependent upon a lasting and constant will, the Hebrews see a justice free from the
vagaries of human caprice. For the Hebrew, social justice is a constant within the very nature of God, which is beyond the ability of man to effect. God's will to justice is both universal, in all His ways, and eternal or constant. In this way the relationship between man and man, which is viewed as an act involving God, must also involve justice as one of its constant elements. If this is not the case then the relationship between men denies the involvement of God, or denies the very nature of the relationship. For the Hebrew, man must act justly if he is to acknowledge the presence of God in his actions.

Interesting to note is that in the Old Testament the word "justice" is normally a verb that implies action. Justice is not a state or a condition but is by its very nature an action. Also justice is not merely the negative action of not doing injustice but the positive action of looking to do justice. Abraham J. Heschel in his book "The Prophets" states that: "...to do justice is what God demands of every man: it is the supreme commandment, and one that cannot be filled vicariously." He goes on to clarify his conception of just action when he writes: "The demand is not only to respect justice in the sense of abstaining from doing injustice, but also to strive for it, to pursue it."(22) The hebraic concept of justice is a concept of action, one looks to act justly in order to
fulfill the commandment of God. This fulfillment can not be vicarious, it cannot be left to others in society but must be a personal action and involvement. It is also clear that the action is not merely avoidance, but a positive attempt to confront injustice and to obliterate it. In order to confront injustice it is necessary to be able to define it with some accuracy. Frank E. Eakin jr. sees injustice as: "Transgression of a neighbour's inherent worth as a creature of Yahweh." and this transgression "...was anathema, whether the means to the transgression was legal or not.... To fail to render to one's neighbour the dignity and respect inherently his was a direct affront against Yahweh, the Creator God whose every relationship was characterized by justice."(23)

More simply put "Justice exists in relation to a person, and is some thing done by a person. An act of injustice is condemned, not because a law is broken, but because a person has been hurt."(24)

Injustice, then, is the act of injuring another person, whether this injury be physical, mental, economic or social, an act which denies that person his or her inherent worth as a creature of God. To be unjust is to fail to give another person the respect and dignity to which he or she is entitled by the very fact that he or she is human. This definition of injustice moves the question beyond another
common present-day parameter, that of legality. Both Eakin and Heschel deny that legality or law provide a true measure of the extent of injustice and in turn the extent of justice. Injustice is possible even though it may be linked with the structures of legality, a point clearly attested to by the consistent legal acrobatics of the Canadian government's historically unjust relationship with the Canadian Native Peoples. Although the action was perfectly legal, backed by Parliamentary legislation, the overall effect was that Indians were slaughtered and the white Canadians failed to render the Indian the dignity and respect which was inherently his or hers.

If justice, then, is an action demanded of man in his relationships, how does one go about administering this justice?

Justice is something positive; it aims at restoring the law that has been infringed first of all by saving the one who had suffered by this violation of the law and on the other side by punishing the one who had made somebody else suffer.(25)

For the Hebrew this type of administration of justice could be defined by the words hesed, mishpat, and tsedeqah, with each word representing a particular facet of the justice process. H.Wheeler Robinson has said that, "To know God is to know One who will carry into effect the mishpat,
hesed and tsedeqah...in which he delights."(26)

In order to more clearly understand the Hebraic concept of social justice perhaps we should examine each of these terms individually as well as some of their intended applications. Following this a more general view of Hebraic justice, particularly the nature of its application, will be presented.

Hesed, Mishpat and Tsedeqah

Each of the three terms has its one-word English counterpart which can to some small degree aid in the recognition of the concepts being verbalized. Hesed is translated literally as "covenant love," Mishpat as "justice," and Tsedeqah as "righteousness." Each of these capsule definitions allows us to more easily identify the term but provides little or no insight into its true meaning. Mishpat as "justice" is not helpful when we know nothing about a definition for "justice," and this ambiguity has been part of the contributing cause to the present inconsistency in defining "justice" and "social justice." It is the intention of this examination to provide more salient points of contact with the three terms and in that way open the door to a better understanding of the term
"social justice." This is a word study, but not an exhaustive examination of any of the terms. It will provide a feeling for the nature of the terms and an overview of their importance to the Hebraic understanding of social justice.

The term Hesed attempts to define the nature of the relationship between men and the relationship of God to man in terms of the hierarchical positions of those involved. "Hesed is an action performed for the weak party by the powerful one, for the situationally inferior party by the situationally superior one."(27) It is "...deliverance or protection as a responsible keeping of faith with another with whom one is in relationship."(28)

Two points stand out about Hesed. The first is that it is the deliverance or protection of another with whom one is in relation. In this way Hesed is seen as an action which attempts to save the one that has suffered or may suffer. It is both preventative as well as restorative in its application, for in protecting, the justice-giving party prevents the transgression which may be planned and by delivering, the justice-giving party is restoring to the transgressed the unjustly taken goods, services, and so on. In this way hesed deals primarily with the sufferer, and this emphasis is clear in the second point. Hesed is an action which has as its object one who, for the moment,
lacks the ability or means of protecting or delivering himself. The term places responsibility on the strong party in a relationship for the well-being of the weak party. This weak and strong party may change as the situation changes, but the responsibility for deliverance and protection remains consistently with the party that is strong in that particular relation.

The party or subject doing the hesed may be human or it may be God, but it is always seen as that party which is situationally superior. The superior party has certain responsibilities and these are clearly outlined by Katherine Doob Sakenfeld in her doctoral dissertation on the word "Hesed".

With a human subject:
1) the word hesed denotes action, not a psychological state.
2) Hesed denotes unilateral assistance for the helpless granted without compensation or condition, not a mutual exchange:...
3) Hesed denotes essential and often indispensable assistance, not extra privilege.
4) Hesed denotes action determined not by law or custom but by personal decision:...
5) Hesed denotes actions which may be promised with or without confirmation by a promissory oath (or covenant); only exceptionally is hesed related to a previous covenant relationship.
6) Hesed denotes action that is not optional but rather obligatory on moral grounds
7) Hesed denotes action which requires special moral qualities: viz. initiative, courage, constancy and trustworthiness.
8) Hesed denotes extra-legal acts or good works deserving special recognition and reward; their omission brings moral condemnation.
9) **Hesed** denotes an action which has its source in God. He desires and commands it, recognizes and rewards it, and punishes its omission.

In theological usage, the **hesed** of God, like the **hesed** of man:

1) denotes action, not a psychological state.
2) usually denotes unilateral help for the helpless without compensation or condition.
3) denotes essential assistance, not mere privilege.
4) is essentially distinct from judicial or legal action. God grants hesed not as a divine judge but as a personal friend and benefactor who fulfills his responsibilities to the helpless whoever they may be, without regard to their merit and often in direct contradiction to His own law.
5) may or may not be confirmed by a promissory oath or covenant.
6) possess certain marvelous characteristics: all-pervading, initiative, irresistible power, never-failing constancy.
7) is worthy of highest praise, and is to be rewarded not by reciprocal hesed but by love and obedience.(29)

By fulfilling the moral responsibility attendant to the position of situational superiority, one does hesed and, in turn, one acts in a just manner to those with whom one is in relation. One also fulfills the protective and restorative aspects of hesed, and, in that way, fulfills moral obligations which are a part of one's social position. To some degree it parallels the medieval conception of "noblesse oblige" but uses as its standard not the social circumstance of birth but the situational circumstance of power. This situation need not be that of a king or lord and his vassal but may also be that of one man who has and
another man who has not.

It was Ms. Sakenfield's conclusion that, in hesed, God's sovereign freedom and His commitment to His people was expressed in one word. Hesed denotes both the dependence of man on God and God's willingness and ability to deliver him. It is hesed that urges God to save man even though He has pronounced judgement on him.(30)

Mishpat, the word normally translated "justice," linguistically descends from the root "sh-ph-t" which means to judge. This root includes all aspects of judgement, and mishpat, in turn, includes this judgement in its own definition. It also stands for ordinance and legal right in some cases but can normally be translated "to give judgement according to a precedent." This precedent is normally the declared word of God as perceived by the society, and, in turn, the judgement itself also becomes a precedent. In short "It is necessary therefore to think of 'doing mishpat' (Mic. 6:8) as meaning 'doing God's will as it has been made clear in past experience'."(31) Mishpat can also be a legal phrase used to indicate Yahweh's sentence on Israel,

In the broad sense Yahweh's mishpat would be his self-revelation, what he has done for Israel, the qualities which he displayed in these mighty acts, the conduct required of Israel when she enters into relationship with a God of this kind, and the implications of keeping or breaking the relationship.(32)
In short, mishpat might be defined as the covenant responsibility of Israel to act in reflection of Yahweh's revelation, revelation given through Yahweh's historical action with Israel. It is what we today might call following the law and keeping the commandments. Yet mishpat is more than just a legal requirement, for the action it mandates moves beyond the legal limits of the covenant. Mishpat also explains the accepted way of acting outside or beyond the covenant. Generally mishpat is presented as the right dealing with others, and as a part of the appropriate covenant relation, it is the appropriate action which has as its precedent the revealed way and will of Yahweh.

For a thing or action to be 'according to mishpat,' it must be filling its appropriate and constructive place within this established order.(33)

To do mishpat is so important to some of the Hebraic writers that it becomes a major pillar in the continued survival of the Israeli nation. Jeremiah said that to violate mishpat is to take the first steps toward national destruction. It was Jeremiah's belief that once people violated their own appropriate and constructive place in the society they, by necessity, stopped being constructive and became destructive. This appropriate and constructive
action which so undergirds the definition of mishpat extends even beyond the people to their God, for Yahweh also does mishpat. As a matter of fact, the people do mishpat because Yahweh does mishpat. In doing mishpat one follows the will of Yahweh, for "To be just is to act according to the right (mishpat), that is to say, not according to an abstract and ideal rule, but according to concrete norms and duties resulting from the social relations in which each is involved. God is just, that is to say, He acts always according to the norms that flow from His nature and the covenant that unites Him to Israel; He complies with what is rightly expected of Him, insofar as he is God and the God of the covenant."(34)

It would be well to note at this point that mishpat is first an action, mishpat is done by a person, as van Imschoot says, it is not an abstract ideal but a concrete action which results from the relations in which one is involved. There is no real way to speak of mishpat outside of this social situation because it is the situation which defines what is and is not mishpat. An action which may be mishpat in one situation may not be mishpat in another. It is for this reason that one must underline that although mishpat refers to judgement by precedent it does not refer to legal penalties which remain unchanged. Mishpat is the spirit of the law, and it is that which it seeks to enforce.
One should also note that mishpat is a salient requirement of any relation to God. It is right that a man can expect mishpat from God, and it is also right that he expect it from his fellow man. One is not free to refuse to do mishpat and not suffer consequences. To not do mishpat, to violate God's justice is tantamount to leading the society to national destruction. Consequently the word mishpat implies a social responsibility of the first order.

In his study of Jeremiah's use of the word mishpat, Dr. Lawrence Toombs notes that in nine out of twenty-one occurrences of the word, mishpat implies "the deliverance of the weak from exploitation by the more powerful members of society."(35) This meaning is also found in large measure throughout the prophetic books of the Hebraic writings. Mishpat, in this sense, places a burden of responsibility on the powerful in society to see that their actions reflect the duties and norms of the covenant and, in this way, protect the weak from exploitation.(36)

Mishpat is thus defined as doing appropriate and constructive action in social relations, in this way fulfilling covenant and extra-covenant responsibility to Yahweh. Mishpat can and must be expected from all the people but especially from the powerful who have the potential to ensure mishpat. And finally mishpat is essential to the continued well-being of the nation and its violation spells destruction and catastrophe.
The third word used to define social justice is "tsedeqah" (alternately tsedeq) whose original root is "ts-d-q" meaning "to be straight." Tsedeqah can be translated "righteousness, salvation, prosperity, and deliverance," particularly in deliverance from Egypt (Isam.12:7f.). It can also mean "to conform to the norm in the affairs of the world" and to be "pure, real and true." Tsedeqah is "...that which agrees to the end to which it has been created... actually fulfills the function for which (he) it exists." In particular tsedeqah stands for the establishment of justice in the land and to do tsedeqah is to actively pursue the just way. Inherent in the definition is that man was created to do justice and to do tsedeqah man agrees to the end for which he was created. In Israel this can be defined as living out his chosenness as the doer of Yahweh's will.

Tsedeqah certainly stands for the establishment of justice in the land.... It is incidental that tsedeq stands for justice. It is incidental because tsedeq actually stands for the establishment of God's will in the land, and secondarily for justice, because that, in part, is God's will. It is 'in part', because God's will is wider than justice. He has a particular regard for the helpless ones of earth to rescue them from the clutches of those that are stronger than they.

The establishment of God's will, and in that way, of justice requires that particular attention be paid to those
who are unable to fight injustice by themselves. Tsedeqah implies that those of power and means have a responsibility to see that justice for all is established. Although tsedeqah means the establishment of justice and righteousness, "It means not only the establishment of righteousness on equal terms for all, but also the vindication by God of those who cannot secure their own rights."(41) In this way tsedeqah introduces a bias or particular emphasis into the definition of social justice. Social justice is not blind; it is not objective. Rather it seeks deliberately to protect and deliver those who are caught in the exploitative grasp of the powers in society. This bias towards the weaker members of society is integral to the definition of tsedeqah, and since it is God's concern to establish tsedeqah, He must be concerned particularly with these weaker members.(42)

Having thus probed some of the definitional depths of the Hebraic concept of justice it is now possible to examine the way in which it is administered and how the various facets of hesed, mishpat, and tsedeqah are woven together in the attempt to actualize the revealed will of Yahweh.

It is clear that, in the Hebraic writings, "Justice was not equal justice, but a bias in favour of the poor. Justice is always leaned toward mercy for the widows and orphans. Divine justice involves His being merciful and
compassionate." In this way justice is a subjective action which weighs the evidence of the social situation as well as the requirements of legal statutes. By so situationalizing justice it is difficult for the powerful in society to exploit the weak through the judicial system. Legal precedent is not enough, since each situation is judged on its own merits and by the spirit of the law. In this way the judge is required to consider the effects of his judgement on the whole fabric of the society, and each case is seen as a part of a greater context. It is not enough to have law on one's side but it is also necessary to ensure that the spirit of the law is being served.

The basic imperative in the search for justice is to ensure the rights of the weak. To be just is not merely an exercise but an urgent imperative upon which the fate and situation of the helpless hangs. It is the fulfillment of responsibility to the society and clearly reflects the will of God for His people.

Justice, however, is not only the deliverance of the weak from the clutches of the powerful, for this is only a part of the action of justice. It is also judgement, the judgement rendered upon the powerful and the exploiter. Justice without the teeth of punishment holds no responsibility for those that would deny it. In order to establish justice it is also necessary to remove from the
powerful the ability to do injustice. (46) Therefore justice also includes the destruction of the ability to do injustice. For to allow the instruments of oppression to survive while looking to deliver the weak from the effects of that oppression is only to tolerate those instruments. One is saying in effect that injustice is a given and that the only option is to live with it, while salvaging from it the human refuse it leaves in its wake. To ignore the instruments of injustice is to permit their existence and in that way to tolerate the human suffering they bring.

Any justification of the wicked is not only an offense against an abstract ideal of justice, but the actual betrayal of the poor and the innocent. Every perversion of justice is also the imposition of suffering on someone who is unable to defend himself against it. (47)

To ignore the instruments of injustice is a betrayal of those for whom justice is most necessary and is a violation of the mishpat which supports the national survival. It is only logical that as long as the instruments of injustice are allowed to exist they will be used, and they will present a clear challenge to the health and security of the society. It is therefore necessary that the establishment of justice include the disestablishment of the instruments of injustice.
Justice in the Old Testament is also communal as opposed to individual in that the society is expected to be just, and any act of injustice reflects directly on the whole society. (48)

Collective responsibility makes every member of society responsible for the actions of that society, and in this way, each individual is responsible to the others to see that justice is done. Thus the already large responsibility which justice carries is made even greater. Unlike present society where an act of injustice is of concern only to those parties directly involved, the Hebraic conception involves all people in the action. Therefore by definition justice is social justice because the actions involved are social or corporate.

It is also clear that justice in the Hebraic definition includes a particular call for justice for the poor. This call is not a call for special dispensation for the poor but for the poor to receive justice and just treatment. Sometimes, however, the poor have been so unjustly treated that special actions are called for to redress the wrong. This, however, is not a special dispensation, it is only a righting of wrong balances. This particular aspect of justice, the care of the poor, is so important to the justice schema that it is incorporated into the role of the ruler. Israel's king is seen as a guardian
of justice and it is one of his duties to see that the poor and oppressed are given justice.(49)

This, then, is the definition of social justice as presented by the Hebraic writings and the interpreters of those writings: First, that social justice is a verb; it is an action which one does or does not do to one's neighbour. It involves God in human relations, for social justice is "God's stake in human history." Literally, social justice is the combination of the definitions of three terms, hesed, mishpat and tsedeqah and takes place only in the context of the community or society. The corporate body is responsible for the just or unjust actions of its members, a conception defined in Israel by the covenant community. It is also a clear and continuing strand in the Hebraic writings that although all men accept the need for justice, most lack any sense of the monstrosity of injustice. It is for this reason that time is spent on the question of punishment of injustice and that justice is seen as such a necessary action. Hebraic social justice is also not only "objective" justice but "subjective" justice, justice which has particular concern for the poor and the helpless since it is they that require protection from injustice. Social justice is by nature sympathetic to the "little man," and its application must include this sympathy. To treat all men as equals is to be unjust, by
this definition, because all men are not equals. Some hold power in certain situations while others do not, and it is the moral duty of the powerful to recognize this and to act accordingly. In this way the use of just means towards unjust ends is implicitly condemned, for to use just means in actions of injustice is to pervert the means of justice themselves.

Maintaining 'law' and 'justice' is therefore to take care that the true relations are not disturbed (mishpat) and that the integrity of each man in the community is maintained fully (tsedeqah). Only thus is the demand of the hesed done full justice, and can the Covenant-relation in the people continue to exist. (50)

From the obvious corporate emphasis of the preceding definition it is easy to see how trying to combine it with the individualistic, Evangelical theology of salvation would tend to produce a tension. The two concepts seem so disparate that it is difficult to conceive of ever resolving their differences. It was this difficulty that led me to question the Evangelical theology of salvation, particularly in light of the previously mentioned reading in Berdyaev and Buber. It seemed to me that the definition of social justice I had been helped to construct, rang in harmony with what I discovered in the Bible, and so if I was to resolve
the tension I felt, I would have to more closely examine the assumptions and pronouncements of Evangelical salvation.

As mentioned before, one particularly dissonant note was the Evangelical emphasis on salvation for the individual and his or her personal experience, between one human being and his or her God. It began to appear that it was this stress on individualism that impeded my attempts to apply Christianity to social concerns. There seemed to be a pressure in Evangelicalism to overlook social justice issues in favour of the enunciated mission of personal salvation. In a way, to be so concerned with saving individuals tended to divert me from the 'real world' into a world of spiritual affairs where the soul of a man came to mean more than the injustice he was enduring or perpetrating. The temptations of isolation and separation from that 'real world' into the spiritual became more evident to me. It also became more apparent that Evangelicalism had the tendency to ignore the evil in the corporate system, the systemic evil, in favour of dealing with the individual evil around it.

As these pressures became more perceptible I began to wonder if I was unique in feeling them or if they were general tendencies in Evangelicalism. If they were more prevalent throughout Evangelicalism, then perhaps it was due to the stress being placed on individual salvation. It is this theory that I will examine, hoping to discern the
potential for isolation as well as the separation and neglect of systemic evil which may lie dormant in the North American Evangelical theology of salvation.
CHAPTER TWO: The Evangelical Position on Salvation

In order to more closely examine Evangelicalism and its attendant individualism, it would seem helpful to first define what is meant by 'Evangelical' in the North American Religious community.

In contemporary American parlance the noun evangical, when not being used simply as a noncontroversial reference to all Christians or all Protestants who regard sola gratia as a cardinal doctrine, refers to those Protestants who:

1) repudiate Roman Catholic polity, liturgics, piety and doctrine, and at least used to regard the Roman Catholic Church as the Anti-Christ;

2) insist upon verbal inerrancy of the received biblical text, tend to interpret revelation in strict propositional terms, and question the value of historico-critical studies of biblical religion;

3) regard the doctrine of sola scriptura as having very serious impact for the devotional life of every Christian;

4) emphasize the experiential dimensions of being or becoming a Christian and hence tend to diminish the significance of the sacraments, a sacerdotal clergy, authoritative hierarchical structures, and doctrinal complexities;

5) understand the ethical teachings of the Bible in a precisionistic or legalistic manner and oppose utilitarian or situational approaches;

6) resist the extension of fellowship or even the name of Christian to persons and churches that do not share these convictions. (1)
Under this definition fall approximately forty million North American Protestant Christians who in turn form a sizeable percentage of the total group of people who endorse Christian principles and theology. As such, this group by its mere presence, exerts a rather powerful influence on the accepted, traditional doctrines of the church and also on the public perception of church doctrine. For this reason, if not for this reason alone, it is incumbent upon us to seriously examine the Evangelicals and their position.

In addition to those points of definition, it has been noted already that for the Evangelical, individual salvation is the essence of the Christian biblical message. (2)

So strong is this Evangelical commitment to individual salvation that C.F.H. Henry, one of its major spokesmen, has seen fit to award it a position of primacy:

...Christian believers will know that their primary mission is to win individuals to Jesus Christ the redeemer and Lord, a task not to be confused with misguided attempts to christianize the world order. (3)  

Not only for Henry but also for the majority of North American Evangelicals, as asserted in the first chapter, the
doctrine of individual salvation provides the basis for their approach to both individuals and society. It is this doctrine which colours and influences the whole of their theology, a colouring which can be seen in many of the modern works which claim as their foundation the doctrines of traditional evangelicalism. It is the theology of individual salvation which forms its approach to humanity, its message of hope which claims that in order for man to find the peace of God's love he must first experience the turmoil of individual transformation.

Not only do men need to know that their sins will bring the inescapable judgement of God upon themselves, but also that they can never enjoy life in its fullness here and now until they become converted and experience God's marvelous transforming grace.(4)

This claim has been advanced by all leading exponents of the Evangelical movement and has found particular expression in the message of the evangelist's crusade. The crusade is seen primarily as the attempt to entice the non-believer into a situation where he will be provided with the gospel message of individual salvation. It is the publicly articulated goal of most evangelistic crusades to increase the membership in the Kingdom of God through the conversion and salvation of as many individuals as possible. One of the most successful of the modern evangelists, Billy Graham, has said that,
It is absolutely impossible to change society and to reverse the moral trend unless we ourselves are changed from the inside out. Man needs transformation or conversion....Our only way to moral reform is through repentence of our sins and a return to God.(5)

The operative phrase here is "Man needs transformation or conversion." and this must be understood in terms of the individualistic conception of regeneration offered in the sentence before. It is clear in all of the messages provided by Graham and other evangelists that salvation is individual and only through individual salvation is the object of social justice going to be achieved.(6)

This individualistic conception of salvation is then broadened to influence a larger area of theology. No longer is individual salvation only the description of man's reaction to his fallenness and God's attempt to personally renew the fallen creature, it expands to fulfill a social role.

Yet Christianity knows—and it dare not forget nor let the world forget—that what the social order most needs is a new race of men—men equipped not simply with new textbooks and new laws, but with new hearts.(7)

Yet even as the principle seems to broaden it remains
well within the scope of the original conception, because the role of salvation remains well within the purview of the individual and his particular interactions with other individuals.

The Christian can testify to the regenerating grace of God, which, in contrast to sin's frequent corroding effect, shapes new sensitivity for righteousness and devotion to duty in the private and public lives of individuals. (8)

Again the operative words here are "in the...lives of individuals.", so as much as this salvation will affect one's interpersonal relationships, it is still clear that the main purpose is the regeneration of the individual believer. Clearly, no matter how the theology of salvation is seen to affect the social behaviour of the individual, the main purpose of salvation is to transform the individual. The possible social effects of this theology will constitute the main body of the next chapter of this study, and so it is sufficient here to note that even among the evangelical spokesmen some relationship between salvation and social action is perceived. It must, however, be kept in mind that that relationship must be based upon the individual personal regeneration of the individual which is his or her salvation.

This individual view of salvation grows out of the
very nature of the salvation experience as evangelicals perceive it. The individual undergoes the effects of salvation as a personal confrontation with his or her own sin. Various churches have confirmed this in different ways, but in essence all say the same thing, that man as an individual is confronted by his sin and in personal response to that confrontation is brought to accept the propitiation of Jesus Christ's sacrifice. (9)

The confrontation is no easy thing and it can be said that "...becoming and being a Christian was and is a shattering experience, neither a churchly performance nor an alternative code of life." (10) Once again the principle mode of operation is one which is individual and withdrawn from the community of the church and from the social expressions of alternative lifestyles.

By this time it may seem that the point of individualism in the Evangelical doctrine of salvation has been pushed too far, that it has been so stripped of exterior ornamentation, that it has a rarified air of unreality. Yet if the truth be known, the concept has not yet been pushed far enough. The treatment presently given lacks the sometimes ferocious intensity which has come to mark some of the more conservative of the evangelicals. This rarification, which some evangelicals require of the concept of individual salvation, provides the direct basis
from which the Evangelical begins. It leads to statements like:

The only normal man is the converted man. Only then is he most free from the tensions and frustrations of life. (11)

Statements, in which the basic assumption is that salvation is individual become identified as the normative absolute for man. Individualism triumphs as it becomes the yardstick by which the normal is measured.

This individualism, first and foremost based in the understanding of salvation as personal encounter, begins to tinge the rest of the Evangelical's approach to religion. The truth and veracity of the Scriptures is tested by the light of personal encounter and finds its major support through its agreement with that personal encounter:

Here we come face to face with that testimony which is absolutely conclusive and unexpungeable. The witness of God is greater than the witness of man. It needs no support, but stands firm by itself. Briefly stated, the position is this: if the Bible is in reality the inspired Word of God, it must as such be self-authenticating; it is in no need of human sanction. God Himself witnesses to the truth of the Bible. As its Author, He also authenticates it to the heart and mind of every believer. It is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that we are brought to faith in Christ, and that saving faith is founded upon the good news proclaimed in the pages of the Bible, and nowhere else. It is by the internal witness of the Holy Spirit that we acknowledge and appropriate the biblical message, and are assured daily and constantly that "all scripture is inspired of God." (12)
Though first denying the need for external verification of the biblical message, the Evangelical goes on to acknowledge that such verification can be found in the individual encounter with the Bible which authenticates the conversion experience. Once again individual salvation becomes the basal assumption upon which to build theology, in this case the theology of biblical veracity. The pervasiveness of this kind of approach was noted by Paul L. Holmer in his critique of the Evangelical approach to theology when he states:

The point is, rather, that the kind of biblicism we have noted makes believing a theology about the Bible almost more important, if not foundational, for believing its content; this same biblicism tends to force belief into a pattern of first assenting to a kind of theism read from between the lines before one can go on to use the lines themselves.(13)

What the evangelical tends to do is to require the belief in the individual theology of salvation as a basis for further theological thought. This belief, in the words of Holmer, becomes foundational to believing the content of the scriptural narrative. This belief also influences the approach to such diverse subjects as Old Testament exegesis and modern liturgical practice. The individual view of salvation provides the hermeneutical tool with which the
believer can approach and understand the Old Testament, and leads to such statements as:

Believers in the Old Testament times are justified in precisely the same way as New Testament believers.(14)

The Old Testament believer thus looked forward in hope to the Christ Who was yet to come. We look back to the Christ Who has already come. All alike are justified by faith in one Saviour whose blood brings to us the blessings of the covenant.(15)

In this way the message of the Old Testament and the message of the New Testament are harmonized along the particular theology of individual salvation and justification, the personal, individualistic encounter with God which leads to personal, individual repentence and conversion. It is through this particular lens that the exegesis of the biblical message must be perceived.

This basic assumption so pervades the Evangelical approach that by inference those who fail to give it heed and fail in turn to provide opportunity for its outworking are viewed with suspicion, for example, C.F.H. Henry's criticism of ministers who find it easier to devote worship time to social causes than to giving an altar call. For Henry the opportunity for outworking lies in the altar call where individuals are asked to approach the altar or
platform in order to commit their lives to Jesus Christ. It is the opportunity to affect that personal encounter with God which will result in the reality of the individual's salvation. To fail to offer that opportunity, while willingly providing the platform for social action, is in Henry's view a distortion of natural priorities. (16)

As we can see from this exposition of Evangelical salvation theology, its major emphasis lies in the requirement that salvation is the individual conversion of particular human beings. Salvation, as a person's experience of regeneration then becomes his or her basis of faith, and tends to influence and bias further theological work.

Regeneration and justification are terms that denote God's part in transforming an individual, while the words faith, repentence and conversion are used to express man's necessary response to Christ and God, if regeneration is to be experienced. (17)

Where did this emphasis originate, what was its history? Did it spring full blown on to the North American religious scene or can its beginnings be found much earlier in American history? Although its origins are very complex, some of its roots can be discerned in its parent movements, those of Pietism and Fundamentalism. Let us now examine
those particular origins so that we might better understand some of the sources and influences that gave birth to the emphasis on individual salvation that now undergirds North American Evangelicalism.

**Historical Roots and Conceptions**

Viewed in the shorter perspective of its fundamentalist past, evangelicalism today appears to be the somewhat moderate outgrowth of an essentially eccentric and separatist religious subculture. On the other hand, viewed in the perspective of a century ago, contemporary evangelicalism can be seen as embodying some of the most deeply rooted traditions and characteristic attitudes in American culture. At times it appears as a beleaguered sect; at other times it still poses as the religious establishment. (18)

One of the most deeply rooted traditions in North American religion, and a practice that finds its continuing expression through the Evangelical drive for evangelism, is the tradition of revivalism. It was in revivalism that the basic emphasis on individualism was expressed most clearly, and as the revivalist movement grew and gained in influence, its emphasis on the individual decision came to occupy a greater role in fundamentalist and later evangelical theology.
One of the conspicuous characteristics both of evangelicalism today and of its revivalist predecessors is individualism. The basic unit in much of American thought was the free individual, so that the revivalists (despite some Calvinistic resistance) came characteristically to seek from individuals voluntary "decisions." Once this personal commitment was made, the process of sanctification was regarded largely in terms of personal purity. Great concern for the welfare of society was often associated with this individualistic scheme, though somewhat as in the free enterprise system the key to collective welfare was to have each individual behaving correctly. (19)

It seems that one of the roots of the evangelical individual emphasis can be found in the fundamentalist revivalists who combined their image of salvation with the prevalent free individualism found in the social and economic spheres. America had come to be known as the land of the free individual, and that identification began to exert an ever greater influence on its religious life.

This emphasis on personal and individual salvation or election went on to permeate the rest of what came to be known as fundamentalist theology. It became so accepted that, early in fundamentalist history it was common practice to assume its existence without necessarily stating it clearly. In the creed of American millenarianism published in 1863 in the journal Prophetic Times, the pervasiveness of the individualist assumption is clearly illustrated.
We believe:...

2) That Christ will so reappear upon earth, to avenge His elect, and fulfill His covenant to them....

7) That the saints shall rise first, and together with such of the living as shall be accounted worthy of such honor, be received up in the glorified state, to share with Christ in His subsequent dealings with our world, and its inhabitants....

12) That only those who are properly awake to these truths, and watchful, and waiting, and looking for the Lord's speedy return, and prepare accordingly, shall escape the dreadful tribulations which are to mark the last years of this dispensation, or secure the high and peculiar honors in reservation for the wise and faithful.(20)

With the use of such words and phrases as 'elect', 'the saints', 'those...accounted worthy' and 'only those awake to these truths', the inevitable separation between saved and unsaved individuals is assumed without being stated.

In the same way the Niagara Creed of 1878 also began with this unvoiced assumption:

...no degree of reformation however great, no attainment in morality however high, no culture however attractive, no humanitarian and philanthropic schemes and societies however useful, no baptism or other ordinance however administered, can help the sinner to take even one step toward heaven; but a new nature imparted from above, a new life implanted by the Holy Ghost through the Word, is absolutely essential to salvation...(21)

The operative words in this statement are, 'the
sinner', words which betray the individualistic intent of the entire statement. To understand the conception of the new life it is necessary to begin with the assumption that the object of salvation is the individual. This assumption had become so accepted by the mainstream of the religious community to which the creed was speaking that the writers could assume that their statement would be read in this way. In both the millenarian creed and the Niagara creed the key words 'elect', 'those awake to the truths' and 'the sinner' served as theological benchmarks which invoked the underlying assumption of personalistic, individual salvation.

Besides fundamentalism and its revivalist emphasis, the most powerful influence on modern evangelicalism was Pietism. Classic reformation Pietism was the European attempt to merge Calvinistic theology with Lutheran foundations seasoned with a generous helping of pre-Reformation mysticism. Pietism has been variously characterized "... as emotionalism, mysticism, rationalism, subjectivism, asceticism, quietism, synergism, chiliiasm, moralism, legalism, separatism, individualism, and other wordliness..." or alternatively as representing "... integrity, goodness and holistic response in terms of lifestyles; regeneration, sanctification, holiness and the work of the Spirit in the context of biblical themes; and
freedom, charity, tolerance and equality in the areas of ecumenism and mission." (22)

As a movement Pietism began with Philipp Jakob Spener and August Hermann Franke and tended to concentrate on the reformation of the church, the use and understanding of the Bible for that reformation, the reformation of lifestyle, the theology of experience and a real hope for the world. Each of these concerns in turn reflected the concern for the salvation and regeneration of the individual, a concern which has grown to influence modern evangelicalism. This individualistic concern has become the basis for the modern critique of Pietism, that it is no more than theological subjectivism. Dale W. Brown argues that this critique is not without modern foundation but does injustice to the genesis of the movement in Spener and Franke.

In their approach to the reformation of the church both Spener and Franke sought to make it clear that their view of individual regeneration was one which was based primarily upon the community of the church. That, "... regeneration results from the activity of God primarily through the church; the fruitful life is life in Christ; and the new man's godliness is intended to reform the church." (23)

Yet Brown admits that even with this clearly church and group oriented position
Spener and followers opened the door for many manifestations of Protestant individualism; nevertheless, they did attempt to maintain a balance between their understanding of God's objective activity in Word and Sacrament and their stress on the individual and corporate human appropriation of Word and Sacrament.(24)

Some possible explanations for this apparent divergence between intent and result will be offered later in this study, but for now it is important to observe that the original assumption is based on the regeneration or salvation of the individual and that this assumption also underlies the subsequent individualistic result.

The Pietistic approach to the Bible and to its use in the reformation of the church was also based upon this individualistic assumption. It was assumed that true exegesis was the internal, personal testimony. It was the experience of the converted individual that acted as the primary exegetical tool, and church dogmatics gave way to a summary of biblical theology.

One must not only come outwardly to an understanding of Scripture, but inwardly to an understanding through the heart, the total being.(25)

In this way the interpretation of the Bible was left to the individual without the balance or parameters provided by the traditional church. Brown recognizes the negative
potential in this kind of interpretation, for "Exegetical study divorced from the counter balance of creed or church... can lead to private interpretation in which the individual tends to find in Scriptures exactly (and only) what he wants to find." (26) and that "The stress on biblical study for all Christians engendered renewed reverence and interest in the Bible and at the same time it led to perils of private interpretation." (27)

This private study of the Bible has been appropriated by the modern evangelical movement whose stress on the veracity of the experience has tended to contribute to Evangelicalism's emphasis on the individual. This potential for private interpretation, seen in Pietism, has become actual in the heir of Pietism, Evangelicalism.

Although Pietism was a movement which advocated change in lifestyle, its major emphasis remained on the regeneration of the individual sinner.

Morality separated from a basis of faith, Spener believed, could be treated by the heathen or Turks just as well or better than by Christians. Mere moral teaching never leads to salvation. "If I preach a hundred years that you should leave the bad and do good," Spener proclaimed, "all is said in vain, where you are not first reborn as a true child of God and from God, for only from this does all goodness flow." (28)

This emphasis continues to be evidenced in the modern
evangelical movement whose proponents say the same things in different words. (29) Their language is more polished and the individualistic method more subdued, but in essence both Spener and the modern Evangelical agree that the mission of the church is first and foremost the regeneration or conversion of individuals.

Particularly long lived in the theology of Pietism was the theology of experience and the belief that experiences center in the soul of the individual. As a result of the seasoning of Mysticism, Pietism began to place a certain emphasis on the personal experience of the believer vis a vis the Christian faith and the Christian God. It became possible to say that "...our whole Christian religion consists of the inner man or new man" (30) and in that way reduce the Christian religion to the theology of experience. Both Franke and Spener attempted to avoid this reductionism by pointing out that the emotions of the experience change while the reality of love and obedience continue. Yet "Even with Spener and Franke there are indications that the internalization of the doctrine of illumination led to an intensification of feelings which penetrated Pietism's theology of experience," (31) and with this intensification, the temptation toward reliance on the individual experience increased. This emphasis on experience became another pressure toward the
individualization of belief and, as will be explained more clearly later, added to the temptation to isolate and separate oneself from those who have not yet had a similar experience.

Even with this intensification of the theology of individualism, which both Pietism and Fundamentalism seem to advocate, both movements can and do claim a social involvement which they believe should be seen as a necessary outgrowth of that individualism.

...the Pietist milieu resulted in a desire to transform the living conditions of the poor and oppressed, reform the prison system, abolish slavery, break down rigid class distinctions, establish a more democratic polity, initiate educational reforms, establish philanthropic institutions, increase missionary activity, obtain religious liberty, and propose programs for social justice.(32)

While fundamentalism and Pietism claim, to some degree, to have fathered the social concerns which resulted in the social gospel movement, theologically the fundamentalists have continued a running battle with the modernist tendencies they perceive there.

While the social gospel and its liberal brethren devoted more and more attention to social concerns, fundamentalists and their evangelical relatives continued to emphasize the absolute need for individual conversion. The original Pietist concern for social issues was allowed to
degenerate as modern Evangelicalism battled to secure the purity of the individualist assumption. An argument of priority began which still embroils the participants: was precedence to be given to the salvation of individual souls or to the changing of social systems?

Before leaving Pietism and Fundamentalism, let me summarize the influences they brought to bear on the nascent evangelical movement in North America. Most basic is the individualist theology which characterized both Fundamentalism and Pietism and whose influence was integrated into all of their theology. This integration was then appropriated by evangelicalism without any attempt to acknowledge the individualist basis which underlay it. These influences manifested themselves in the evangelism which was tied historically with revivalism, with the use of experience as a basic hermeneutical tool, and with the view that regeneration of individuals would provide the basis for any social change. Contemporary critiques have clearly pointed out the existence and influence of these individualist strands.

More and more over the years after 1925, it became the habit to separate evangelism from social concern and to emphasize the individual and private at the expense of the corporate and public aspects of Christianity. (33)
Even Dale W. Brown, whose defence of the social corporate aspects of Pietism in *Understanding Pietism* is designed to minimize its individualist emphasis, is led to note that, "From the beginning of the Pietist movement this individualization began to corrupt basic doctrines dealing with the theology of experience, of salvation and of conversion." (34) and that, "To attain personal peace and to escape the problems of the world and have a good feeling in church are viewed as the essence of practicing Christianity. This has often led pietists to make an easy peace with the world in the social sphere because the social and political spheres are wicked anyway and have nothing to do with Christianity." (35)

All of these critiques, originally levelled at Pietism and Fundamentalism, can with equal vigour be levelled at modern evangelicalism. Of particular concern is the individualization which tends to move the theology from social concern to private concern and personal piety. Why this is and how it comes about will be the subject of the next chapter, where we will examine some of the theoretical implications of the individualist assumption and the nature of the temptations which can and have aided in the degeneration which Brown, et al, have perceived so clearly.
CHAPTER THREE: Some Implications of the Theology of Individual Salvation

The theology of individual salvation as illustrated in the last chapter, forms one of the basic assumptions which underlies the whole of the theology of North American Evangelicalism, and its influence can be noted in all Evangelical activities. What are the implications of basing a system of belief on one such assumption, as the Evangelicals seem to have to have done? What effect does this individualist assumption have on the theological decisions with which they are faced? What effects, overt or covert, will that assumption have on the future actions and growth of the Evangelical movement? What effect has it already had?

In this chapter I will examine the theoretical inclinations of Evangelical theology towards positions of isolation and separation. (For the purpose of this work isolation is the separation of an individual from the social whole, while separatism is the voluntary segregation of a group of people from that whole.) These biases would seem to result from the Evangelical's inordinate stress on individual salvation. I hope to point out how this individualist assumption pressures the Evangelical towards a
religious life that tends to ignore social issues in favour of individual spiritual religion. It is my contention that the Evangelical theology is persuaded by the individualist assumption to reject social action in favour of individual regeneration. Thus the believer is urged to isolate him or herself from the world in order to find assurance of salvation, and through this isolation loses contact with the social injustice which ravages the world, resulting in a religious life which tends to deny interest in questions of social justice.

The consequent lifestyle is one which reinforces the original individualist assumption and continues to press for more isolation. This isolation, in itself, is not unreasonable as long as the person recognizes and accepts it as isolation. However, the moment the Evangelical proposes to influence social conditions by opposing social injustice, the isolation which may characterize his or her position can militate against his or her effective involvement.

The question of how this isolation or separation comes about and to what degree it is aided by the influences of the individualist assumption will be the focus of the following analysis. Generally the analysis will be a theoretical one examining potential and latent influences that might direct the Evangelical towards isolation. It will indicate possibilities and likelihoods and not
necessities. In no way does this examination claim to show the 'must be' of the situation but only the 'might be.' It is entirely possible that an Evangelical might avoid the isolation that this analysis points to, but the intent of this chapter is to warn that the stress on individualism may harbour a complementary stress towards isolation.

Before proceeding further it is necessary to realize that assumptions made by an individual or group will influence their decisions, and that basal assumptions. That is, assumptions upon which world views are based, will exert a great amount of pressure and influence on the subsequent directions taken by that group or individual. Examples of this are numerous. In western society we assume that the green of a traffic light means to go. On the basis of that assumption we then regulate the flow of traffic at various intersections, expecting others to obey the assumption as well. It is on the basis of this shared assumption that we feel secure in driving through an intersection with the knowledge that we have the green, the 'go' signal while the crossing traffic has the red, the 'stop', signal. Deeper yet are our assumptions concerning the way of the economic world. We in the west base our actions, however loosely, on the assumption that capitalism, or what is called 'free enterprise,' is the best way to run an economic system. This assumption then exerts its influence on the economic
direction of western society and in essence predetermines many of our economic actions. In this same way the individualistic assumption also exerts its influence on those that accept it as basal to the life of faith. Decisions in the life of faith will be influenced by that assumption to the degree that it may, in some instances, pre-determine the particular direction of that life. It is from this understanding that we will proceed: that the individualist assumption exerts influence on the life of faith decisions made by its adherents.

The moment that an individual or group accepts a certain view or assumption as primary or basal, that group or individual constructs for itself an ever growing maze of decisions that stand between its present position and its end goal. As a person moves through this life, through the maze, he or she is faced with points of decision, with corridors that run in two or more directions. Upon deciding on one of the corridors the maze then grows out from that decision, setting up further decision points and more corridors. No decision can stop this process but it is possible to stultify the growth of the maze by deciding to remain stationary and choosing not to decide. Even this action will influence the maze. For the maze itself is dynamic. It will offer other corridors of decision, the passage of time or the change of situation will close some
corridors while opening others. So even by electing to forgo a decision the person will continuously be faced with a decision.

Because of the original character of the basic assumption, that it is most important for the individual to be saved, the believer is faced with the temptation to isolate him or herself from the society of the unbelievers. Within the society the principal perceived status is damnation(l), and the pressure is always there to conform to the state of that society. In order to avoid this pressure the believer may begin to isolate himself from society, continually turning inward for salvation and its attendant security. This isolation may begin slowly at first, the believer may isolate only certain activities or certain thought processes while in the main staying within society, yet this is the beginning and a door has been opened which is most difficult to close.

One might first isolate one's devotional life from the life of the society, one might focus more on the feelings and emotions produced by one's individual experience. As the life of faith progresses, one's attention will be drawn inward to the self and to the self's particular experience of the divine. In this way the believer walks the corridor of isolation. When faced with a decision between the way of society or the way of the
individual, more interior pressure will be exerted by the way of the individual, thus moving the believer further into self and further away from society. This movement begins to accelerate as fewer and fewer needs can be fulfilled by society and so society is left behind. The believer then lives more and more of his life of faith within the construct which his or her concentration on self and self-experience has built. The construct of isolation begins to take on a logical self-rationality which continues to exert more pressure towards more isolation. The believer begins to perceive that society cannot or will not understand his or her corridor of isolation, that the only real way to salvation and sanctification is through the personal struggle for purity. This struggle is one which must, by nature of the basic assumption, take place in the isolation of the self and the self must actualize the feeling of regeneration. Society may become the other against which the self can measure its own regenerative progress and in that process the self becomes more isolated. Primary religious experience becomes personal experience isolated from society, and even when the believer gathers with others to worship, the emphasis is on personal devotion and private edification. The religious life may become a life devoted to personal betterment which views the mass only as a hindrance to that growth, until it becomes clear
to the believer that only in isolation, only in the validity of the personal religious experience will he or she find the security and hope which brings life.(2) The isolation becomes complete and the individual has arrived at the point where society no longer holds any of the virtues which he or she seeks, and his or her need for society becomes a purely mechanical need to somehow weather the storm until the fulfillment of the self is completed in the individual last judgement which will confirm the validity of the interior experience.(3)

As stated earlier, isolation is the self separating from society, and separatism is a group of people voluntarily segregating themselves from society. Where isolation is the progressive movement of the self inward in the search for purity and sanctification, separatism is the progressive movement of a group of like thinking individuals away from the mass of society. Once more the group is faced with the decision between following the way of society or separating itself from society in order to reach its goal. Just as the individual is pressured towards isolation by his or her perception of society, so too is the group forced to react to the pressure of the unregenerate society. The first point of decision may be a seemingly insignificant one, perhaps the conviction that the liturgical practice of society's church is lacking and the group feels that it must
meet separately in order to supplement that worship. Yet with this step the group has enhanced the potential for separation as they have clearly separated one aspect of their religious life from the general religious life of society. The pressure to widen that separation, to take upon themselves more and more of the functions of the religious life, becomes increasingly stronger and begins to take on an indisputable rationality. Since it is clear that society is not as knowledgeable as the group, whose individual experiences have collectively revealed this, it becomes more logical that the group attempt to actualize their understanding in a clearer manner. More former societal functions become group functions as the group begins to try to understand and bring to life its shared perception. As the group does this it begins to move ever further from society until it reaches the point of decision between itself and society. At this point the group is faced with the essence of the separatist temptation. Is it possible for society to actualize the shared experience of the group or is the only way this actualization will take place to be the group's separation from the society? Is it possible to regenerate the society or is it necessary for a dedicated, believing group to split from the society in order to act as an example of what regeneration can do for society? This decision is influenced to a great extent by
the degree of separation already achieved by the group and by the degree of perceived actualization of the shared belief in the already separate activities. Success on the part of the group in actualizing its particular beliefs, a success which has brought it to the point of decision, will militate for a decision for the group and against the society. The group may note that its past attempts at the actualization of the shared religious experience have been moderately successful and then the very success of the separation militates for further separation and the group may choose to look to itself for further religious growth.

Both isolation and separatism tend to tempt the believer away from social concern. By removing the believer from the mass of society both isolation and separatism minimize any social influence that the believer might exert. More and more the religious life becomes the concentration on isolated personal sanctification or on separated group actualization. Less and less will the group or individual be concerned with the society as a whole. Attention is focused more on the self and less on others. Personal experience becomes the yardstick of life and society becomes the other which attempts to deny that experience. As isolation grows the individual believer begins to perceive less necessity for direct action within the mass of society, for any such action directs the attention away from the
individual self which is striving for sanctification. It is 
the same with the group which separates, for its major 
objective is to actualize its shared vision of the religious 
life not direct action in society.

Both the isolated and the separated however may 
continue to hold to some conception of the goal of a 
regenerate society. Both might seek to influence that 
regeneration by providing the unregenerate with the example 
of the regenerated life. It is possible that they may see 
their religious life as that shining beacon set on a hill to 
which the rest of unregenerate society can look. If society 
fails to perceive the example, this lack of perception 
becomes further proof that the isolated or separated life is 
the only way the individual or group will reach 
sanctification. It may be with a sense of relief that they 
view their own removal from the kind of society which must, 
by experience, fail to perceive their way. If they were 
still in society, it might be reasoned, that they too would 
fail to perceive the beacon which shines forth. The problem 
is however, that by the very nature of their position the 
isolationist and separatist options influence the society 
indirectly. Because they have become removed from the 
mainstream of society they can no longer expect to exert 
direct influence on it. In order to explain this lack of 
influence and ultimately their lack of effect, they may seek
to point out that it is the will of God that some should be saved and others not. In this way the problem of lack of influence becomes immaterial because no matter what amount of influence possessed, some in society will not be regenerated. Thus, the separation from society becomes complete, and the separate group now sees only its own regenerate self and looks to that time when God will affirm its regeneracy.

Closely allied to the temptations of isolationism and separatism are two other potential detours, those of the necessity of personal assurance of salvation and elitism. Both of these avenues can tempt the believer into the corridors of isolation or separation. Both find sympathy also in the basic assumption that the individual is the object of salvation.

From the individualist basis the believer can be drawn into the potentially endless search for the elusive assurance of salvation. To be sure that one is saved becomes the goal of one's search. Without this certainty the believer might begin to search for ways or methods to be assured. As this search for assurance goes on the believer is forced further into himself or herself because that is seen as the only legitimate area for the search. Since salvation is an individual, personal affair it will do the believer no good to search in society for assurance. He or
she must instead look inward and examine closely his or her own religious experience and the feelings and emotions attendant to it. The Bible is approached from a personalistic perspective with the object being to experience again the security and assurance of the original conversion experience. The only stimulation for the religious life becomes the interior stimulation of the search. The individual becomes more isolated from society as his or her search takes him or her further into him or herself. As the search progresses, more and more energy becomes devoted to it, less thought is directed outward, while more attention is directed inward. Any thought of social concern begins to fade as more of the believer's attention is directed to the search for assurance. As decision points are reached they are either neglected or the decision is made on the basis of the need for assurance. Social action, beyond the mechanical actions of socializing, is postponed until the search can be declared a success.

Through the search for assurance of personal salvation, the believer is led into isolation. He or she will come to particular decision points and may then decide on a corridor which leads towards isolation. These consequences may not be as complete or as irreversible as the consequences of the isolationist option, but it still works to divert the believer into a form of isolation.
The temptation of elitism tends to occur as a decisive step in certain forms of isolationism and separatism. Elitism, the perception of self as particularly distinguished from the mass of society, can result from the isolationist search for individual religious actualization or from the separatist attempt to become the example for the others, the society of the unregenerate. In this way, the perception that the individual as believer has found a particular corridor which has to some degree actualized the religious life, becomes that believer's distinguishing characteristic which sets him or her apart from the mass. The elite knowledge, known historically as *gnosis*, (special knowledge) becomes another pressure upon the individual or group to continue to decide for isolation or separation.

These four potential corridors are only four among many which await the believer if his or her belief is based primarily on the assumption that salvation has as its object the individual. With every life step taken, with every decision faced these potential detours may await behind the closed door. With every decision for one of these corridors the potential for more such decisions becomes greater. At each nexus of decision the individualist assumption will pressure the believer to choose one of these paths, one of these diversions into isolation and separation. It will do this because "A religious ethic based on the idea of
personal salvation of the soul is a minimalist ethic, an ethic of transcendent egoism. It calls the human personality to arrange things happily for himself while other men and the world are unhappy; it denies the general responsibility of all men for all,"(4)

It may then be said that the goal of the regenerate society is essentially alien to the individualistic assumption, because that assumption calls for the believer to happily arrange his or her affairs, and it does not call primarily for societal concerns. Yet Evangelicals insist on pairing the two into the same yoke, and later we will see how C.F.H. Henry proposes the alliance between the two.

Historically these potential detours have been manifested in the growth of the Evangelical movement. Its revivalist forefather has been characterized as the attempt to find personal purity, in which the search for sanctification was contained within an isolationist or separatist manner.(5)

When faced with the growing problem of urbanization after the first world war, those Evangelicals who had previously supported social action, found it easier to opt for isolation,(6) thus illustrating that even after deciding to pursue the social goal, the Evangelical may likely be pressured into deciding for the options of isolation or separation when the path becomes more difficult. The
individualist assumption carries within it this continuing pressure to isolation, and its maze continues to offer the temptation of isolation at every decision point.

Robert D. Linder has noted that, "More and more over the years after 1925, it became the habit to separate evangelism from social concern and to emphasize the individual and private at the expense of the corporate and public aspects of Christianity." (7)

It becomes possible for Millard Erikson, author of The New Evangelical Theology, to advocate separatism as a necessary outgrowth of the individual decision and to develop rationales to buttress the decision to separate. The very act of separation is made to seem positive and constructive toward the religious goal of salvation.(8)

A contemporary example of this latent pressure to separate is "The Christian Yellow Pages." Distributed in more than 25 American cities by some Evangelical churches as a supplement to the local telephone directory, the Christian Yellow Pages are designed to encourage Christians to do business with other Christians. In order to advertise in the Christian Yellow Pages one must sign a statement which states that you are "a born-again Christian believer," a designation largely confined to Evangelicals. In this way the Catholic, Jewish and non-evangelical merchants are excluded from the Evangelical community. "The idea, says
Carl Goebelt, who sells space in the Atlanta directory, is more or less to keep money within the kingdom. There's a certain margin of profit you have to have to do business, so wouldn't you, as a Christian, rather see this go to help support another Christian who has the blood of Jesus Christ flowing through his veins?"(9)

Finally, the potential isolation in the search for assurance was observed by Sydney Ahlstrom who has said that, "...the development of overwhelming importance is the new kind of Christian piety that grew out of the anxieties produced by the doctrine of election. The problem of assurance became existentially central. When neither professions of faith, nor attendance on the ordinances, nor outward evidences of sanctified living could assuage this concern, only an inward experience of God's redeeming grace would suffice." (10) In this way Ahlstrom begins to perceive the pressure within the individualist assumption for assurance, a pressure which can draw the believer inward into isolation and away from social concern.

From this examination a number of inferences can be made. There seems to be a latent potential for isolation and separation in the Evangelical theology which arises out of its acceptance of the belief that salvation is individual. These potential tangents are not confined to the Evangelicals, and have also been documented in other
religious and social movements. Neither are these tangents necessarily negative, particularly when the group or individual openly decides to pursue one of them. However, when Evangelicalism begins to indicate that one of its concerns is social justice or social regeneration then it becomes necessary to understand that one of its basic tenets of belief holds within it the potential to divert the believer from that stated goal.

It has been my purpose, not to show the uniqueness of the Evangelical difficulties or to pronounce isolation as negative, but to warn that in the pursuit of social justice, to begin with the individualist assumption is to begin with a principle that has the power to divert the believer from achieving that justice. Some Evangelicals have negotiated the maze successfully, arriving at their goal of working for social justice while still holding firm to the belief that salvation is individual. This possibility is not denied by the critique; it is only pointed out that this success is one which may have circumvented the isolating power of the individualist assumption. It is also the case that for the few that negotiated the maze successfully, there are many others that have become trapped in the corridors of isolationism, separatism, the search for assurance and elitism.
CHAPTER FOUR: Individual Salvation and Systemic Evil

In the preceding analysis one point seems to become more and more apparent, that as a result of the assumption of individual salvation, the Evangelical may feel an increasing pressure to isolate or separate from the social whole. This pressure toward separation is one which exists at most life organizing decision points and, as such, can result in the detaching of the Evangelical individual or group from the society in which he or she is seen to function. This segregation from the society can result in the construction of an idealized world in which the believer can live according to abstract principles which allow him or her to shut his or her eyes to the reality in which he or she lives. In this way the believer can ignore the social ties which make him or her a part of all humankind, while pursuing a life of individual sanctification.(1)

In this abstract world the believer can deal with injustice on a one to one basis through the attempt to renew individual ideals and can ignore the reality in which he or she deals with mankind as a whole. Actions are seen to effect only those immediately involved in the relationship while one can disregard the reality in which all actions influence all people in one way or another.(2)
The watchword of this abstract world is the regenerate individual and "It is assumed that if all men are brought to Christ, social evils will disappear through divine intervention, and it is not necessary or even desirable to involve oneself in restructuring society to make it more equitable. If one wishes to improve society, he will work more diligently at converting the individual members that comprise it."(3)

Finally the pressure to separation allows many Evangelicals to withdraw into their own ghetto where they can avoid the influences of secularization that seem to convulse the rest of society. The ghetto also affords the separated Evangelical the opportunity to remain "...oblivious to the changes occurring in the world around him....This social isolation makes the conservative Christian (Evangelical) a stranger in the larger society, distrustful of its inhabitants, intolerant of divergent views and deeply insecure."(4)

As a result of this separation, the social theology offered by these believers is one based on individual regeneration. It is said that if enough individuals are converted or regenerated then society will experience social transformation.(5) Billy Graham has written that to attempt to change the social order through legislation or social restructuring will not succeed and that the only successful
method of social change is for the whole of humanity to turn to Jesus Christ, at which time we have the immediate possibility of a new Christian world order.(6)

Paul Henry, assistant professor of Political Science at Calvin College, has said:

While not rejecting the obvious truth that human behaviour is in part conditioned by the environment, Christians recognize that the root cause of evil in society rests with man's rejection of God. Therefore, the primary social problem for the Christian is not how social institutions can be modified to change human behaviour, but rather how individuals can be changed by God, and how changed individuals can effect change in the larger social order.(7)

This belief that society will be transformed only through individual regeneration is a common strand throughout the North American Evangelical community and is regarded consciously as 'the Evangelical' social methodology.(8) Although the Evangelicals seem to have some conception of the inherent tragedy in the world (9), they fail to allow that some of that evil is generated by the structures in the world. This corruption can be called 'systemic evil,' that is, the evil in society above and beyond the cumulative corruption of the individuals in that society. By neglecting systemic evil, the Evangelical may be ignoring pressures in society which may frustrate his or her attempts at social change through individual
regeneration. If the structures of society are corrupt then it is possible that those regenerated individuals that are re-entered into the social structures will find it impossible to carry out their social concerns.

One analogy for this may be the tree that is rotten. It will continue to rot regardless of the good branches which may be grafted to it, and only by cutting down the tree and planting a healthy one will one have a healthy tree. In essence the Evangelical social methodology seems to advocate the grafting of the good branches without realizing that the roots and trunk may be rotten.

Before further analysis of the individualist's neglect of systemic evil and its attendant dangers, it may be helpful to outline more clearly the notion of systemic evil and the ways in which social structures tend to pressure its individual members into an acceptance of its corruption and even into aiding in its defense and propagation.

This analysis will concentrate on the work done by Herbert Marcuse in his book One-Dimensional Man and will attempt to provide a simplified outline of his investigation. It is offered here to familiarize the reader with one critique of systemic evil and to illustrate the way in which structures influence their members. In this way I will try to show that by focusing on individual
transformation to the virtual exclusion of systemic reform, many Evangelical spokesmen are overlooking a powerful social context in those forces which dominate society to such an extent that the Evangelical attempt at transformation may itself be transformed into social preservation, but more on this point in the next chapter. For now I shall endeavour to describe the rudiments of systemic evil and some of the ways in which it manipulates man in society.

Deeply involved in the study and analysis of the corrupting influence of social structures is a group of social psychologists commonly referred to as the Frankfurter School. Among its members are Herbert Marcuse and Theodore Adorno, two men whose analysis of the power of modern society to exert its influence on its members have spearheaded the growing critique of systemic evil. In concert with the Frankfurter School, Russell Jacobi, has also written some very insightful works on the way in which society continues to maintain its control over the individual. (10)

Prior to any presentation of their critique of systemic evil it is necessary to understand one particular term which might cause some confusion, that term being 'individual.' Marcuse, and Jacobi, use the term 'individual' to refer to the integrated human being whose autonomous ego allows him or her to stand in creative
critical awareness of the society in which he or she is involved. This human being has integrated both the necessity of privatization and the need for social interaction into a dynamic life of social understanding. It is not the individual as an atomized social object sufficient unto itself so lauded by the North American hero syndrome, the hero that requires no assistance from anyone. The individual is not an island unto him or herself, an island requiring no one else's support, no outside systems of social interaction. The Marcuse/Jacobi individual is one that is most aware of his or her need for social support and for interpersonal interaction as a primary function of being an individual. Unlike the Evangelical individualist, who sees his salvation in terms of his particular chosenness by God, the Marcuse/Jacobi individual recognizes that only through the actualization of the interpersonal web of relationship that is society, will he or she be find liberation. Never alone, never uniquely atomized, the Marcuse/Jacobi individual is aware constantly of his or her interdependence with other human beings. In this way the insistence by Marcuse or Jacobi that the present society tends to massify individuals while the goal should be to affirm and create individuals, is not a call to Evangelical individuation but a call to free the individual's private sphere from social control and to allow the integration of
the creative, critical awarenesses which result in their social interrelationships. In this way they call for the revolutionary change of present social structures and systems. While Marcuse and Jacobi speak of the integrated, social individual, Evangelicalism tends to speak of the socially integrated atom which has experienced the personal regeneration of conversion.

Russell Jacobi has written a book entitled Social Amnesia in which he proposes the theory that modern man writes a history designed to forget his past. This "...is really a form of what he calls social amnesia, a willful repression of things we already knew." (11) In writing such a history designed to be forgotten, modern man is repressing the creativity of the individual into the collective need to conform to the status quo. In essence, the movement in modern society is to propagate the theory that what is new is creative, what is new is collective and that there is no need for the creative impulses of the integrated individual. Historiography becomes the classification of ideas and critiques and by such a classification, the concepts of any critical function are defused. They become models to be examined and admired, much like museum exhibits, rather than critical examinations of the faults and foibles of society. Critique of modern society is disallowed by the notion that society is
progressing and has no need for history or critique. Potential critiques are defined as ideologies, which the West denies by characterizing them as opposite to 'common-sense' and as the vehicle for the introduction of totalitarianism. Criticism is viewed as an individual aberration requiring individual psychological therapy, and society as a whole remains thus free from criticism. All in all society attempts to validate itself by an a priori acceptance of the rightness of what exists. To attempt to change society in any qualitative way is to be met by all of the social forces presently aligned against change.

The autonomous ego---always problematic---proves to be no match for the social collectivity, which has at its call alternatively brute force, jobs, television, or the local newspaper. This is no conspiracy; rather it is ingrained in the social relations which both nourish and poison human relations. What haunts the living is the spectre of individual and psychic suffocation; this is the spectre that conformist psychology seeks to put to rest.(12)

Any illusion of movement or change remains just that, illusion, as new theory is replaced by new theory without any perceptible movement on the part of society toward a better understanding of the place, power and need of the individual. Society forgets criticism, because to remember it is to allow that society must change in some perceptible way.
This critique of the need to forget is also enunciated by Herbert Marcuse, whose work One-Dimensional Man is an attempt to point out how society affects that amnesia and how the state battles to retain its hold on the individual. This amnesia and manipulation form the essence of systemic evil, the need for society to defend its corruption as the necessary way of existence.

Marcuse's analysis, as the rest of the Frankfurter School, rests in his acceptance of the Freudian view of man which sees man developing into the integrated individual as the id, ego, and superego which together mediate the father/son struggle. This mediation should then result in the individual developing a unique personality and ethics from which he or she can then begin to live creatively and integrate into society while still retaining the ability to critique that society. Society then becomes the web of relations between these integrated individuals which seeks to free itself for more and more creative action. It is Marcuse's thesis that modern society is structured so as to limit this creative growth, to massify the web of relationships by co-opting the creative struggle before it can produce the integrated individual. In this way society becomes the supplier of creativity and ethics and the atomized individual becomes a tool to be used to defend and support this co-option. The atomized individual receives
its identity and ethics from the society, and social pressure and intrusion is used to prevent the development of the autonomous ego described by Freud.

Society even goes so far as to appropriate psychoanalysis as offered by Freud, in order to further subdue the individual, not to free the individual to creative function as Freud intended. Psychoanalysis, when employed by the system, leaves the patient unhappy but 'cures' him to function 'normally' in society and in this way assures the individual's continued submission to society as he achieves the ability to 'fit in.' To 'fit in' is the aim of all members of the system, that they might share the collective identity and avoid the formation of the individual identity. It is through Freud's analysis of the drives of the individual that society has been given a tool to be used to ensure continued submission.(13)

In order to understand the pervasive influence of the system, Marcuse contends that one must examine the nature of the father/son, authority struggle and how it finds modern manifestation. It is in this struggle that the individual develops the power of mediation, to reflect critically, and to establish that private space from which the individual can then introject into the social web creative, critical ideas and concepts. Marcuse's opinion of the modern system's approach to this vital life function is both short and damning:
First, the classical psychoanalytic model, in which the father and the father-dominated family was the agent of mental socialization, is being invalidated by society's direct management of the nascent ego through the mass media, school, sports teams, gangs, etc.\(^{(14)}\)

The system becomes the sculptor of the ego and the fires of struggle which would temper the individual ego creatively are dampened by the pressure to conform to the system's publicized conception of the ego that fits in. In order to be suitable to society the ego becomes the object and in this way finds its satisfaction.\(^{(15)}\)

The individual is urged to relinquish control of functions for the good of the system, and personal autonomy becomes subsumed in the 'all' of society.

Conscience and personal responsibility decline "objectively" under conditions of total bureaucratization, where it is most difficult to attribute and allocate autonomy, and where the functioning of the apparatus determines---and overrides---personal autonomy.\(^{(16)}\)

This loss of control and autonomy, rationalized as necessary to the continued smooth function of the group, moves beyond the logical areas of transfer to those areas of personality that contribute critical analysis to the mental processes of the individual, areas such as conscience and responsibility.
In the advanced industrial societies, the administration of things still proceeds under the bureaucracy of domination; here, the perfectly rational progressive transfer of individual functions to the apparatus is accompanied by the irrational transfer of conscience and by the repression of consciousness.(17)

The individual, convinced of the 'need' to forgo individual function for the good of the system, by also forgoing the function of conscience and the ability to evaluate critically becomes caught in the limbo of non-identity. So the person, deprived of the power to build and protect a personal, private realm from which to approach society, looks to society for his or her identity. He or she either manifests the neuroses and psychoses which come to psychological treatment or he or she finds identity by accepting the socially required modes of thought and behaviour, in this way allowing identity to be dictated by the social structures.(18)

Left with only the options of psychosis or identification the majority of individuals choose identification, only to find that identification holds its own psychotic difficulties and that by identification they become an integrated cog in the very system which originally denied them the chance to develop into creative individuals. In so doing society perpetuates its control and pressure on
the nascent individuals still to be subdued.

In Marcuse's analysis, society is seen to be that force or structure that co-opts the vital struggle of the individual and offers instead the need to fit in or to seek identity with society. In this way the system perpetuates itself and its evils, allowing no critique, stifling the very struggle which is expected to give birth to such a critique. This pressure and socializing is all encompassing and defines the basic function of all of the faculties of the system and in this way the society becomes 'one-dimensional.'

It is Marcuse's contention that society today dominates the individual not through terror but through technology, propagandizing the virtues and necessity of its overwhelming efficiency and increasing of the standard of living. In so using technology as the proof of the society's progress, the system integrates Jacobi's social amnesia and Marcuse's loss of individual function. The technology becomes the reason for existence, and its maintenance becomes the function of the individual. All that came before technology becomes forgotten as useless to it or as crude techniques no longer viable, and all that would critique technology is caricatured as 'anti-progress.' Social change as qualitative, positive progress, is contained and denuded of any critical place in the system.
The pervasive influence of society, the systemic evil, spreads through all of the individual functions, exerting its pressures and offering its temptations to more and more identify with the group. In this way the system consolidates its control over the individual, removing the opposition between the individual and society, making the system and individual one.(20)

The difficulty of critiquing this modern system becomes clearer as one examines its basic assumptions: that progress is good, that such progress will come with technology and that the product of that progress is the continued rise in the standard of living.

Under the conditions of a rising standard of living, non-conformity with the system itself appears to be socially useless, and more so when it entails tangible economic and political disadvantages and threatens the smooth operation of the whole.(21)

The very security of the system becomes its best defense, from which it can argue that critics threaten the 'good life' and to change means to give up the standard of living which has become so good. To criticize a high standard of living becomes analogous to criticizing 'mom and apple pie' and 'biting the hand that feeds you.' It just isn't done.

In this way the possibility of liberating the
individual, either through therapy or regeneration, becomes more remote. Arguments for emancipation become arguments against the security offered by the system. Liberation itself becomes more inconceivable as the individual becomes more and more socialized into rationalizing his or her necessary involvement in the system. As the individual continues to use and consume the products of the system, the thought of critiquing it becomes more frightening and more unimaginable.(22)

The group and the individual combine to deny the need for liberation through their acceptance of the need for the products, mental, emotional and physical, of the system. This is so true that it becomes a characteristic of society.(23)

With this loss of the feeling of the need for liberation the individual loses the power of critical reason and the only reality he or she is left with is the "submission to the facts of life" and to the continued propagation of those facts. The individual becomes the tool of his own oppression. The systemic evil has come full circle, by controlling the growth of the individual ego, by directing that growth into submission to and identification with the model set by the group, by pressuring the individual into accepting the false needs supplied by them in place of the true needs of integration and liberation.
Finally the individual becomes the system, and the good of the system becomes the good of the individual and vice versa.

The people are led to find in the productive apparatus the effective agent of thought and action to which their personal thought and action can and must be surrendered. And in this transfer, the apparatus also assumes the role of the moral agent. Conscience is absolved by reification, by the general necessity of things. (24)

Together the individual and the group come to perceive their function as the defense and propagation of society. The system becomes a vicious circle which continually expands and propagates itself while molding its citizens to its specifications. People become the consumers and manufacturers of those needs which the power structures have inculcated, needs which allow them to comfortably neglect any real movement toward social change. (25)

Marcuse's analysis of society seems to point out that the pressures to conform and the ability of the group to defend itself against critique are awesomely powerful and that the atomized individual has little or no chance to defend himself against those pressures. It also might be assumed that to return to this system individuals whose basic assumption lies in the power of individual action, is to take too lightly the system and its power. And yet it is
this very action that Evangelicals who propose social change by individual regeneration are advocating. However, to attempt to change the individual without also attempting to change the system in which the individual lives, is to attempt what seems by Marcuse's analysis to be impossible.

By merely regenerating individuals, without concurrently changing society, merely helps those individuals to become the focus of the group's attack. All pressures will be brought to bear on the individual to conform to society. Methods of manipulation, honed through the continuous formation of individual egos into the whole, will be called upon to remold and reintegrate that individual into the existing status quo, and these are methods of manipulation which the regenerated individual still carries within him or her. Assumptions by which the individual has been nurtured will be used to attempt to conform the individual to society, and any critique the individual might offer will be met with the combined forces of the technological apologetic and the need for security which the group has developed. Any critique of society offered by the individual will be perceived by the majority as a threatening attack. Change, if advocated, will be met with accomodation or with technique, and any movement toward a regenerate society will be met with the charge that the individual refuses to accept 'the facts of life.' As such,
any attempt at social regeneration will be characterized as attacking the rising standard of living, as advocating economic and social chaos and as arising from an inability to fit in. To regenerate the system seems to require more than merely regenerating individuals; it requires some revolutionary changes in the fundamental structure of the system. Yet Evangelicals, in their naive unwillingness to consider seriously the power and corruption of society, continue to advocate individual regeneration as the way of social change. Too often this regeneration, much like modern psychoanalysis, leaves the individual 'happy' by 'curing' him enough to allow him to function 'normally' in society and permitting him to fit in. The regenerate believer comes to conform to society while believing that he or she, individually, is not of that corrupted culture. The purpose of systemic evil is accomplished, and potential social change is once more thwarted.

Through Marcuse's analysis of social manipulation, I have tried to point out the power and influence which the system brings to bear on its citizens. This analysis is neither complete nor necessarily authoritative, but it does point out certain social trends which can be shown to exert dominance over large sectors of North American society. It helps to more clearly illustrate the principle that structures influence people, a principle which the
Evangelicals seem to discount when they propose individual regeneration as their social change methodology.

The Evangelical may not agree with the conclusions of Marcuse, or with the emphasis he places on particular social forces, but he or she should allow that Marcuse's analysis raises questions which must be confronted.

Considering the rather negative and one-sided picture which has been painted in these last two chapters, it is only fitting that the Evangelicals be given the opportunity for rebuttal. In order to facilitate this I would like to examine a work in the field of social ethics as presented by a leading Evangelical theologian. How does he propose that Evangelical theology deal with social change? Does his recommendation reflect an understanding of the pressure which individualism exerts on religious life, the compulsion to isolate as well as the constraint to ignore systemic evil? If so, how does he suggest those stresses be countered? On the other hand, if there is no such understanding, is it possible to discern in his presentation the very strains and stresses which I have begun to enumerate? It is with this and other questions in mind that I now move on to Aspects of Christian Social Ethics and its author C.F.H. Henry.
CHAPTER FIVE: C.F.H. Henry and the Evangelical Proposal

Through the last two chapters, our discussion has been primarily theoretical, focusing on potential difficulties which could face Evangelicalism as a result of its emphasis on the individuality of salvation. Our speculations in the areas of decision points has shown that there may be latent pressures in the individualist position towards isolation and separation from society. We have also noted that this potential isolation may in turn render useless certain social justice actions on the part of Evangelicals because of their forfeiture of direct social influence.

Our analysis of systemic evil has served to point out that the evil in society may result, not only from individuals doing evil, but also from the coercion by social structures for people to do evil. In this way we have posited a situation where individual regeneration, as a means toward social justice may likely neglect the need for structural change.

Yet Evangelical theology continues to advocate individual salvation and individual regeneration as its basal assumption for Christianity and Christian social action. In light of this position it seems that the
theoretical analysis presented earlier should now be tested against the particular theology being offered by Evangelical thinkers. In this way the preceding analysis can be tried against a concrete proposal. In order to do this we will now focus on a particular work by C.F.H. Henry on Christian social action. Our examination of Henry will provide us with that testing ground which will illustrate how the pressures toward isolation and the compulsion to neglect systemic evil manifest themselves in one Evangelical's work.

Henry has been chosen because he is one of the recognized Evangelical spokesmen currently writing. His publications have made him one of the leading theologians of the Evangelical movement and in the period between 1956 and 1968 "Henry was Evangelicalism's foremost journalist and strategist, as the founding editor of Christianity Today."(1)

Throughout the examination, other Evangelicals will be referred to in the footnotes in order to corroborate Henry's points, showing that his thoughts parallel, to a striking degree, the attitudes of the Evangelical community as a whole. In this way our analysis, while concentrating on Henry, is also reflective of the larger Evangelical movement.

The central question is this: how do Henry and other Evangelicals deal with the pressures of isolation and
systemic evil? Are those pressures perceived, or do they influence without being recognized consciously?

*Aspects of Christian Social Ethics*, published in 1964, seems to be Henry's attempt to evaluate the role of the Christian community in the pursuit of social change. It provides a rather clear exposition of Henry's basic schema, examining the role of Christianity in social transformation, the Christian view of work, the Christian stake in legislation, and the nature of God and social ideals. In this way he attempts to provide both a practical and theoretical exposition of the topic in a way which would be deemed acceptable to the majority of North American Evangelicals. It does not claim to speak for the whole of the Evangelical community, and Henry himself would deny any intimation that he is a spokesman for anyone but himself. However, it must be understood that a large majority of North American Evangelicals reflect Henry's position.

Henry's understanding of the Church's role in social action is stated quite plainly in his introduction:

In the performance of its mission in the world, even the Christian Church was drawn to neglect its supernatural resources and —in an apostate mood—relied instead upon education, legislation and compulsive techniques to achieve social transformation.(2)
In this he echoes his own later statement in *Faith at the Frontiers* where he indicates more clearly that the blame for this apostate mood might be laid at the feet of modern theologians who, by promoting secular philosophies, have undermined the faith of the Bible.(3) That faith can be summed up as belief in the power of prayer and the regeneration of the individual.(4) The regeneration of the individual becomes, for Henry, the basis for social justice, and every act of social justice must relate to the Christian message of individual regeneration.(5)

It is because the world has failed to recognize the need for supernatural perspectives that all secular attempts to establish social justice have failed. It is Henry's contention that in order to promote social justice the Church must stay with its mission and urge its individual members to seek society's regeneration by fulfilling their Christian and civic duties.(6)

The question for Henry is not whether social involvement but how, by the Church as an institution or by the individual? The answer to that question is not long in coming as Henry goes on to praise the American system of separation of Church and State, indicating that he would see involvement as being the responsibility of the individual, while the institutional Church continues to concentrate on its mission to proclaim to the world that man must repent and become regenerated.(7)
The mission of the Church is to remain aloof from social involvement while propagating the Gospel of individual salvation and urging its members to involve themselves in society by fulfilling their civic and religious responsibilities as individuals. Henry views with alarm the tendency that the American scheme of separation has shown of late, the tendency toward domination by either the church or the state, because for the Church to become involved in social matters is to invite the domination of the State by the Church or the domination of the Church by the State. Neither prospect leaves Henry satisfied.

After having stated his opinion on the who of social change—the individual or the institutional Church—Henry goes on to examine the how of social change. It is his observation that "The Christian task force is divided today about the best method for improving social conditions. The problem may be stated this way: In seeking a better social order, to what extent shall we rely on law and to what extent on grace? How much shall we trust legislation and how much shall we trust regeneration to change the social setting? What should we expect the State to contribute and what should we expect the Church to contribute, if we are seeking a society ruled by justice and love?"(8)

It has been the case, Henry argues, that American social movements have ignored evangelism and individual
regeneration in favour of legislation, education and mob pressure, a neglect which has rendered the Church socially impotent. (9) The true balance between legislation and regeneration, for Henry, is to view legislation as the means of preserving what is positive in society while regeneration is the means by which to effect social transformation. (10) There are those in the Christian circle that, lamentably, have become indifferent to social change and have instead become preoccupied with personal saintliness, piety within the church circle, and preaching of salvation in isolation from socio-political events. These groups are as wrong as those that look to legislation as the major tool of social transformation. Yet Henry fails to see that the isolation which he laments is an outgrowth of the very theology of individual regeneration which he proclaims. He neglects the implication that these isolated groups stand as a warning to the Evangelical cause and that without extreme care, they too might be tempted into that isolation or separation.

The how of social change, for Henry, falls into four broad categories which he labels the strategies of revolution, of reform, of revaluation, and of regeneration. All attempts at social change fit into one of these four categories.
By revolution we mean the radical change of social patterns, in their essential constitution, through violence and compulsion. By reformation we mean the gradual but pervasive ethical amendment of particular abuses which secures a decisive improvement of prevailing social character and forms. By revaluation we mean a fresh intellectual comprehension and direction, whereby social life and structures are critically reassessed in light of transcendent moral norms. By regeneration we mean transformation by supernatural impulse in individual lives whereby the social scene is renewed through divine spiritual motivation.

These definitions are in themselves very interesting and much could be made of the assumptions and inferences which underlie them, but that task is beyond the scope of this present work and is brought up only to point out that while I will use Henry's categories, they do not necessarily represent accurately my own understanding.

Almost immediately Henry showcases those two strategies he sees as most extreme, those of revolution and regeneration. It is his contention that these two strategies are not only the extremes of the social change spectrum but that, because they mutually exclude each other, they are in conflict. For Henry, revolution denies the existence of divinely given structures in society and has as its object the destruction of ultimate norms as they are represented in the social structure. A prime example of this is communism, the revolution that would replace God-given norms with totalitarian, anti-Christian
governmental institutions. The contrast to the revolutionary strategy, for Henry, is the classic regeneration strategy of the Christian church which sees society as divinely ordained and seeks to return the world to the divine intention. Where revolution would destroy society, regeneration would reconstruct it.

The former (communist revolution) brings the whole socio-historic movement under the criticism of Marx in order to destroy it, and the latter (Christian regeneration) under the criticism of Christ in order to renew it.

Between revolution and regeneration lie the strategies of reform and revaluation, neither of which have the radical presuppositions offered by both revolution and regeneration.

In this way Henry, who has already accepted the need for a radical change in society, has polarized the readers by offering the choice between revolution and regeneration as he has defined them. Also he has, by characterizing the regeneration strategy as Christian, inferred that those who would argue for revolutionary change are non-Christian or worse, anti-Christian. For Henry, Christianity, since it is first and foremost concerned with the supernatural redemption of sinners (read individual salvation) and since Christianity's concern for social change is a result of that mission, it must opt for the regeneration strategy because
it provides a theological basis for social action, a basis rejected by the revolutionary (read communist) strategy.

The regeneration strategy insists that revelational theology is prior, and depicts the Living God as dealing simultaneously with man's spiritual and material condition. The Church derives her social message from divinely revealed principles. By contrast, the other strategies exalt the social issue above the theological, and prize the Christian religion mainly as a tool for justifying an independently determined course of social action. (14)

In this way Henry may just have begun to walk the path of elite separation where those in the Church, the Christians, are seen to have a truer understanding of the place of the Church in social action than do non-Christians. He does not counsel this type of elitism, but its seeds reside in the extreme polarity he is suggesting.

Henry then goes on to examine the dynamics which each of the strategies suggest as the force which will promote social change. Revolution, he argues, tends to rely on brute force and incendiary violence to promote social change (15), while reform relies on legislated morality or political compulsion. Both revolution and reform look to political change as the force which will promote social change, and both neglect the need for moral renewal. Revaluation tends to look to moral education and propaganda to persuade men to be true to their inherent moral
superiority, but it tries in no way to affect moral renewal. Only regeneration takes seriously the need for moral renewal by relying on the spiritual renewal of individuals to effect social change. (16)

Since by definition the first three strategies deny the need for moral renewal, the Christian Church must accept the regeneration strategy as its own. Hermeneutically, Henry is rigidly employing the individualist assumption in order to isolate the regenerative option from the others. By so doing he begins also to separate himself from any potential balance which may be offered by the other three strategies. Not only that, but by so defining his position Henry is also moving closer to those decision points where the pressure is to isolate from society. By polarizing his discussion in this way, the decision being offered is to accept the regenerative option in toto and deny the other options. By so doing, the decision to opt for regeneration becomes a decision to eliminate discussion between the regenerative option and the others, thus isolating the believer from the non-believers.

Having thus outlined his perception of available social change strategies and having chosen the strategy of regeneration as the necessary strategy for the church, Henry goes on to examine the area of work. In this way he is addressing what he perceives to be the major bone of
contention between the revolutionary and regenerative strategies. Since the revolutionary strategy finds its best expression in communism and since communism bases itself upon the Marxist analysis of labour, it becomes necessary to provide the regenerative strategy's answer to the Marxist critique.

For Henry, work or labour is the way the Christian believer answers God's call for him or her to serve God and to serve his or her neighbour.

According to the Scriptural perspective, work becomes a way-station of spiritual witness and service, a daily-traveled bridge between theology and social ethics. In other words, work for the believer is a sacred stewardship, and in fulfilling his job he will either accredit or violate the Christian witness. When viewed as a priestly ministry, man's labors thus become "good works" that radiate from a spiritually dedicated life.(17)

Christianity sanctifies work and makes it the arena for man's public relationship with God. This Christian view has become lost today since work is no longer viewed as a holy vocation pursued in order to fulfill God's call. It has instead become man's way to fill his barren time. Because work so occupies man, the Church, in order to have some relevance, must address itself to work. In so doing the Church must re-establish the holy nature of work as a calling of God. The Protestant Church must avoid the
Catholic Church's pitfall of a so narrowly defined holy vocation that applies only to the clergy or priestly class. By the doctrine of the 'priesthood of all the believers,' the Reformation once more expanded the definition of holy vocation to include all those that labour. In this way work gains meaning, and the Western labourer is protected from the communist romanticizing of labour. Yet Henry would not sanctify all work, for there are those types of work that degrade men, work that supports other men's sin, work in pornography for example. Work, for Henry, is meant primarily to be a time of service and self-giving, not a time of acquisition, and work is designed to promote the human good.

Henry then goes on to show how the Bible itself promotes work and how God becomes the archetype of the creative worker. This examination is conducted in direct contrast to the Marxist critique. Jesus is held up as the shining example of the fulfilled labourer as he worked at his carpentry, thus inferring that, since Jesus laboured and accepted his work and Marx did not, work is a Christian virtue. (18)

Having in this way presented the Christian view of the sanctity of work, Henry goes on to examine the present conditions of the contemporary labourer with the intention of answering the Marxist critique of labour conditions. It
is Henry's claim that Marx, in his analysis of the English work situation, generalized certain unique conditions of labour which he perceived in an attempt to criticize the whole of the labour situation, in that way painting all work with the same black brush. It is Henry's contention that historically the Marxist critique is in error, for "In capitalistic countries the constant improvement of working conditions in this century has exposed the emptiness of collectivist intentions that intolerable exploitation is characteristic of capitalism, and necessary to its survival."(19)

Things have not degenerated as Marx predicted, contends Henry, but rather they have gotten better. The labourer's standard of living has not been declining; rather it has been improving. This, for Henry, supports positively the regenerative strategy's contention that work is a holy vocation and is not the exploitation Marx had said that it was. The difficulty with this logic lies not in its truth or falsity, but in the basic acceptance of the system which it seems to advocate. The Marxist critique becomes characterized as irrational, because it is said to deny the reality of the positive rise in the standard of living. It seems that Marcuse's contention that "Under conditions of a rising standard of living, non-conformity with the system itself appears to be socially useless, and the more so when
it entails tangible economic and political disadvantages and
threatens the smooth operation of the whole."(20) bears
itself out. Henry's defence of the system's rising standard
of living, becomes a defence of the corrupted society. It
begins to become clear how the Evangelical position has the
potential for neglecting the existence and power of systemic
evil. This potential for neglect becomes actualized further
when Henry pursues his defence of Western society against
the Marxist critique, under the guise of defending the
regenerative strategy against the revolutionaries.

The chief threat which Henry perceives in the Marxist
critique is its movement towards a welfare state in which
men will live without work, where work itself will become
unnecessary.(21) By encouraging the labourer to look to the
state for welfare, communism is setting the stage for the
Welfare State, a state Henry views both as a threat to the
present system and as the beginning of communist
totalitarianism. Yet by so attacking the Welfare state,
Henry once again provides a defence for the present
system.(22) In essence his plea is to accept the present
Western society as it stands or else we will promote
communist state welfarism. In short, by denouncing the
Welfare State Henry provides an implicit defence of the
present State, in essence a defence of the present
corruption. Henry's argument opens him to the potential of
neglecting the injustice in the present system in order to avoid the perceived evil of the system he is critiquing. To neglect the corruption is to neglect the powers and pressures which society can bring to bear on the regenerate individual when he or she is reintroduced into that culture. It is also possible that by his line of argument, Henry may be led to neglect certain areas of society which may require change. He may allow his social critique to be hindered by a blind spot of his own creation, the blind spot created by his implicit acceptance and defence of the present system.

It is Henry's further contention that if the assembly line system is evil or poses a threat to the worker it must be condemned. However, he says that this is not the case, that the assembly line is not a threat to the worker and that the problem lies not in mechanical engineering but in human engineering. The worker must be handled (manipulated?) in such a way as to allow him to better fit into the assembly line. The worker must enjoy his labour which is a holy vocation and in this way, he will contribute positively to the efficiency of the whole. Henry must again be careful that by pushing his argument against the revolutionary strategy he does not unwittingly fall into providing an apologetic for a defence of the status quo with all its contradictions and potential inhumanities. (23)
Yet, Henry, determined to press home his argument and finally pinion the revolutionary strategy on the horns of his logic, presents what must stand as the ultimate defence of the present system:

The Christian worker, however, even on the assembly lines can find a sense of ultimate purpose and meaning unknown to the unbeliever. ...Even monotony can be justified in the ministry of God and of humanity, if it stems from a constructive activity that has no better alternative.(24)

With these words Henry crosses the line between attacking the revolutionary and defending the system, and himself presents the prime argument of defence used by society, that there is no alternative and so the worker should accept, even rejoice in, his position within the present system. With this argument, Henry becomes a willing apologist for the system. In all this, Henry has shown that the system progresses and illustrates this progress by referring to the increasing standard of living. Also, he has denied the viability of the welfare state and so feels compelled to accept the present system as that within which his regenerative strategy must operate. In this way Henry may tend to lead his followers to an acquiescence to society which enslaves them and provides comfort by assuring them that their acquiescence is the sign of the Christian as holy labourer.
The critique of systemic evil indicates this potential flaw in the Evangelical argument by pointing out that in order to regenerate the society one must accept it and by accepting it one also accepts the power, pressure and goal of the system. Henry, and with him many Evangelicals, seem to have accepted the system and therefore have helped it to suffocate any move toward substantive change. (25)

Henry has allowed himself to be made into an apologist for society by saying that because it is getting better it must be allowed to continue. In this way his attack on communism pulls him into the neglect of the systemic evil and this neglect projects on his further program of social action a blind spot which effectively ties his theology to necessary continuation of the Western culture. He has begun to succumb to the "pleasant forms of social control and social cohesion." (26)

Yet Henry's blind spot is not so large as to obliterate completely any negative view of society, for he goes on to affirm not only the need for present social change but also the necessity of examining certain practical aspects of the proposed methodology of that change.

The difficult question of law and gospel is now brought to the fore as Henry examines the relationship of legislation and regeneration to the methodology of social change. For him the core of the question remains the role
of the institutional church in social change. Is the church to participate in legislative change as a way of transforming society? No, says Henry. Legislation is never the way to social transformation. Legislation serves only to preserve that which is positive in society while social transformation, the goal of the church, must be achieved by individual regeneration. By attempting to use legislation to regenerate society the church has misunderstood the place of legislation.

Historically the church has, a number of times, attempted to use legislation as a means for social change, but this has always ended in failure.

To achieve a Christian society by political action is, therefore, not the church's objective. Using government as a transforming agency to produce a social utopia, and projecting the Kingdom of God as essentially politico-economic in character, have harmed both the character of pure religion and the cause of government.(27)

By attempting to use legislation, the church is transgressing the necessary separation of church and state, and by so doing, it co-opts the role of the state, an action which is bound to fail. In attempting to use the power of the state, the church is only adding to the totalitarian power of the state, for now both church and state operate in concert. Rather the church must recognize the necessity of
separation, it must affirm the divine mandate of the state to effect social discipline and it must so instruct its members. (28) Also the church must call the state to its duty of rendering justice by offering constructive social solutions to its critiques. If the church fails to do this it will find itself in concert with the forces of injustice.

The state's role as enforcer of justice is one which is divinely mandated and, as such, places a responsibility both on the state and the individual, for the state must acknowledge its responsibility to justice and the individual must accept that the state is God's way of preserving justice in the fallen order. (29)

Once again Henry's argument has come round to an implicit defence of society without realizing the corruption in it. For all practical purposes the state is somehow abstracted from the fallen order. It is seen to be above the evil, in some way and so does not participate in the corruption. Henry ignores the argument that the state is the system and as such is open to the critique of systemic evil. Rather the state seems to be viewed objectively, abstracted from its surrounding environment and, thus, can be regenerated without changing the structure. Society is objective and so all is made to depend on the character of those within it. Those that operate the state are seen to influence its fulfillment of the role of arbiter of justice,
but society is not seen to influence those that operate it. Yet the critique of systemic evil has pointed out that society is not abstract from the worldly context but is rather one of its major supports. In addition it has been pointed out that society does in fact influence those that operate it and that the evil in the system is more than the sum of the individual evils within it. It is impossible to abstract the state from the world as Henry has done, and for that reason, Henry's further argument must be suspect.

But to continue, Henry sees in this church/state separation the positive means whereby the church can function more clearly in its goal of regeneration.

Where the claims of justice and law are obscure, there the understanding of redemption will also be confused. On the other hand, a nation whose conscience is sensitive to the objective character of justice and law and morality provides an ideal climate among the citizens for the effective preaching of the Gospel.

The purpose for Christian involvement in the political sphere, to any degree, is two-fold, to assure the freedom to pursue the goal of individual regeneration and to assure that life continues to be liveable. The state serves a second function beyond the maintainence of justice; the state also serves to illustrate the present corruption of man from which the individual must be saved. The fallenness
of society becomes the most effective illustration of man's need for regeneration.

The church and, in particular, its individual members, must act as an example to the rest of society of what it means to be regenerate and whole. It is only by such example that the church will work effectively to regenerate society, and regeneration by example, regeneration of the individual, is the only way in which society can be changed.(32) However Henry does hasten to point out, rather incongruously, that some thought must be given to change in social institutions.

No doubt moral duty as defined solely in terms of individual behaviour is inadequate; in order to penetrate the whole of community life the demands of ethics must confront the powerful social institutions in the areas of business and labor(33)

The place of this admission by Henry in the whole fabric of his argument remains unclear and its rather isolated occurrence, without supporting argument, may lead one to wonder to what degree Henry has incorporated this injunction into his theology.

Henry then goes on to further explain his conception of the believer as example by emphasizing that through exemplary civil obedience the Christian is showing his love for his neighbour. In this way the Christian's political
influence is indirect and consists of individual witnessing to those around him or her, and in this way, the church will influence the nature of public opinion.

Unfortunately, public opinion is more easily aroused to demands for political action than to appeals for the personal self-discipline and moral earnestness so necessary in a sound social order.(34)

Having thus abstracted the institutional church from any political role in society, Henry must now provide Christianity with some tool which it can employ in order to effect social change. This tool, not suprisingly, is the regenerate individual through whom the church can influence the social order indirectly.

To this point, Henry's discussion has been open to the critiques offered previously. One has already begun to sense the potential neglect of the power and influence of systemic evil and also the potential within Henry's theology that will segregate the believer further from the general population, thus increasing his or her susceptibility to isolation or separation. The positive role given to the believer as example infers a certain elite separation from the people. The very argument that Church and State must necessarily be held separate seems itself to condone isolation and separation. To allow that the church cannot influence the social sphere directly is to confirm that the
church must isolate or separate itself from that sphere. Having done this, what is left to inspire the believer to any social action beyond the mechanical actions of daily living? What remains to stop the church from isolating itself totally from social reality and concentrating only on the recognized 'church function' of individual regeneration? It seems there is very little left, yet Henry's new focus on the practical application of his approach may answer these questions.

The Church's mission in the world is spiritual. Its influence in the political order, therefore, must be registered indirectly, as a by-product of spiritual concerns. The Church as an organized movement must not allow its own energies to deteriorate into direct political activity, but must encourage its individual members to fulfill their political duties as a spiritual responsibility.(35)

Once more the emphasis on the individual which grows from the individualist assumption exerts its influence. It is clear that the way of change must be through the individual, and as such, the church as a whole cannot become involved. But this non-involvement is not absolute, "And in no case ought the Church---except perhaps in the most extreme emergencies---directly address the government, as one corporate body speaking to another, in political matters."(36)
Even with this exception the point is clear: the church as a body must stay out of the political arena. The church's emphasis must be on prayer and evangelism and only indirectly on promoting justice in the social sphere. (37)

Why this aversion to direct action by the church? Why the strident injunctions against political action by the organized church? For one thing, Henry finds that political compulsion through legislative reform does not produce good people, and for Henry, it is absolutely necessary to produce good people. For another, the church, by supporting legislative reform, may be helping to lay the groundwork for the kind of political coercion which characterizes the totalitarian state. By supporting certain attempts at legislative reform the church is also supporting a method which the state can use to gain illegitimate ends and powers. All in all, the mission of the church must remain a mission to the individual. (38)

As mentioned before, this is not to say that the church has no social ministry. The church cannot see social injustice merely as an opportunity for evangelism because it does have a responsibility to social justice, the responsibility to proclaim the just principles of the biblical social order. The church, because of its mission to the individual, has a responsibility to defend and define human rights, a responsibility it should fulfill through the
human rights movement. However this responsibility can, and should, be fulfilled by the individual believers with only the indirect pressure of the church institution.(39) In addition, the church must beware that its message not be mixed up with such social panaceas as welfare statism.

But the Church can be for international justice without in Christ's name promoting world federation; it can be for world peace without opposing just war; it can be against destitution without promoting forced redistribution of wealth—unless injustice is to be fought with injustice.(40)

In this way, Henry's blind spot, once again restricts his view of the options available to the church. Because of his perceived necessity to defend his position against the revolutionary strategy, Henry is pushed into some implicit faith in the present system, at least to the extent of denying the welfare option. In this way, along with the stated goal of producing civil obedience, the church runs the risk of becoming a bulwark in the defence of the very system it hopes to change.

Henry seems to recognize the risk inherent in his approach when he goes on to state that "The Church must not identify itself completely with any of the prevailing secular political, social or economic theories."(41) It is the church's duty, he maintains, to evaluate current social, political or economic options in order to judge their
conformity to biblical principles, (principles like the separation of church and state, like the need for individual regeneration) and, in that way, decide what system it should support. (42) This process of evaluation is not designed for the church as a corporate body but rather for the individual believer and acts to call that believer to his or her Christian responsibility.

Biblical revelation confines itself largely to ideal principles of social order; it does not commit itself to particular parties or programs of social reform. A serious approach to political responsibilities, however, must move from the norm of principles to involvement with personalities, parties and programs in the given situation, and must grapple with their respective claims to serve the cause of justice and truth. Here the individual Christian must commit his personal support; but he has no right to commit the endorsement of the Church as a whole. (43)

So in essence, it is the duty of the individual, not of the institutional church, to fulfill Christianity's responsibility for social justice. This position is completely consistent with the original assumption, that the object of importance in the religious view is the individual. If the individual is subject to regeneration then it is logical to assume that the individual is that part of Christianity responsible for the achievements concomitant to that regeneration. It is also logical that this position of individual responsibility might be open to
the same cautions, the same critiques, to which the individualist assumption is open. It may be expected that the view of individual social responsibility is capable of the potential movement toward isolation, separation, assurance and elitism just as the theological assumption was. It may also be as capable of ignoring the true power and temptation of systemic evil as was the theological assumption of individual regeneration.

The assumption of individual responsibility denies the Christian the opportunity to ignore social action and it is Henry's contention that:

Anyone who excuses himself from the need of understanding political issues, and foregoes an intelligent opinion of them, is not really worthy of the privileges of citizenship; he cannot escape a measure of blame for the political injustices and human misery that follow ill-judged legislation.(44)

Yet even in this call to responsible action, Henry is not willing to abandon his insistence that "If regenerated men permeate national institutions with the truth and power of dedicated living, a "new order" of social life may be expected to follow."(45) No matter how responsible Christian political action may be, no matter how well the individual believer fulfills his social responsibility, it still remains the case that the only truly efficacious method of social transformation is to people the world with regenerate men and women.
After all his analysis, the fact still remains that for Henry the primary assumption which must, by necessity, underlie all Christian action is the assumption that to effect social change one must regenerate individual human beings. The individualist assumption continues to act as the guiding light for social theology, and thus social theology, as presented by Henry and as accepted by a large part of the Evangelical movement, continues to operate with all of the potential difficulties brought forward by the two previous critiques.

Henry does not end his book here but goes on to discuss the nature of justice and love and the current inability to separate the two. In essence the argument continues to focus on the need, in society, for the government and the church to fulfill their clearly defined, separate roles. He then ends the work with an analysis of Christianity and revolution in which he points out that Christianity cannot take part in revolution but may approve of the results of revolution. One such 'appropriate' revolution is the American Revolution which provided the basis for the system he now implicitly or explicitly defends. On the whole, however, it is Henry's contention that true Christians will oppose revolution; they will be civilly obedient, as the Christians under the exploitation of Rome were obedient. They will prepare for martyrdom, as
is their fate, and, with Jesus, they will denounce any attempt to overthrow the State.

In summary let it be pointed out once again that Henry's work *Aspects of Christian Social Ethics* is but one of his books concerning the role of the Christian in the religious and social life of the world. What is important about this examination is that it points out clearly the potential difficulties in the Evangelical social theology that result from the Evangelical desire to base his or her approach on the individualist assumption. The call for indirect social action opens the door to the isolation and separation of the church from the world. This separation may be further aided by the doctrine of separation of Church and State. The expectation that regenerate individuals will regenerate society remains open to the possible neglect of the existence and power of systemic evil. The use of the individualist assumption might result in the personal search for assurance of salvation and in that way paralyze any work toward social change.

Each of these potential dangers lurk behind the theology and argument Henry presents in *Aspects of Christian Social Ethics*. Without extreme care and caution, the believer applying that argument might fall prey to one or more of the pitfalls indicated. It is also the case, however, that with responsible, concerted effort the
believer will effect certain social change, and yet, because of the blind spot which Henry exhibits in response to radical alternatives to the present system, these changes may be more cosmetic than substantive. (46)

I have now come to the end of my presentation of Henry’s, and the Evangelical’s, understanding of social change. It is noteworthy that throughout his work, Henry has consistently operated from the presupposition that salvation is individual. As a result his suggestions have exhibited a tendency to ignore the potential isolation which such an assumption seems to offer. He has also allowed himself to become so concerned with defending what he sees as positive in Western society that he has, knowingly or unknowingly, presented a rather comprehensive defense against any radical social alteration. In essence the Evangelical’s approach, as enunciated by Henry, might be summed as: change yes, but transformation, unlikely.

With this I have once again arrived at the point where I began. Social justice as a concern seems to be opposed by the emphasis placed on individualism. My investigation has only more clearly illustrated this dilemma. Yet I have made some progress. By more precisely analyzing the influence individualism has, I have begun to understand its power in my own theology. I have been able to discern how tempting it can be to me and other
evangelicals to isolate or separate from society. I have also begun to perceive the influence of the evil or corruption which constantly entices me to accept society as a given. Yet, counterbalancing the temptation to isolate and to neglect the corruption of the system is the call for social justice which I perceive in Christianity. This dialogue, this confrontation, then, is that which may spur me on to find an alternative. I cannot dispose of my Evangelical heritage like a mechanic throwing out a dirty rag; however, I can and must realize that my inheritance is at best a mixed blessing. To be concerned with the individual is necessary otherwise human beings will become, for me, objects which make up a mass but I must also search for a way to accommodate a wider appreciation of mankind as a whole. Such an understanding would then act as a deterrent from isolation and would constantly bring to mind the corruption that pervades social structures.
CONCLUSION

This work, as with any such attempt to examine a particular group or a certain set of beliefs, has raised a number of questions which as yet remain unanswered. What is the Evangelical to do with regard to the pressure for isolation and separation? How is he or she to be cognizant of the potential for injustice which seems to permeate some of the social structures with which he or she interacts? It is not my intention to attempt to answer these questions in any detail. To do so would require a monograph greater in length than this present work. However, I would like to explore a promising avenue which this investigation has suggested to me and raise some of the interesting alternatives it might recommend.

A prime consideration seems to be that both the risk of isolation and the pressure to ignore systemic evil seem to be rooted in the emphasis that North American Evangelicals place on the regeneration of individuals. It is this stress which directs their thinking so that they tend to overlook questions of social action in favour of seeking individual conversion. The Evangelical is pressured "...to relate to an unreal world where injustice is supposedly healed by calling for renewed individual ideals."
This worldview "...conveniently ignores the real world where all I am and do affects the poor and captive with whom I am involved in countless ways."(1) It was originally this particular contradiction between the 'unreal world' and the 'real world' which had precipitated my own break with my Evangelical context and started me on my journey to find a strategy whereby my growing social concern could find expression without losing what I perceived as the hope of the Gospel as presented by Jesus Christ. By examining the individualist assumption upon which my theology had been based I have taken the first steps on the road to finding that alternative.

From this investigation I have learned that by stressing one particular aspect of a belief one becomes vulnerable to pressures which urge you to ignore certain areas of concern. With the Evangelical emphasis on regeneration the interest has been to save individuals and in that way to affect society. This stress on the individual has caused the social theology of some Evangelicals to ignore the need for a change in the social system.

Carl Henry may have unwittingly provided an alternative to the Evangelical approach when he presented his categories of social change strategy. He indicated that there were four different classes of social strategy, namely
revolution, reformation, revaluation and regeneration.(2) He then went on to attempt to show that the only acceptable strategy for the Evangelical, and in turn for Christians, was that of regeneration. In this he seemed to be reacting to his own individualist assumption. Unfortunately, in his need to defend the legitimacy of the regenerative approach, Henry was forced to deny or neglect any positive contributions which might have come out of the other three.

Perhaps a potential avenue of study is opened by the four strategies Henry has presented. It may be possible that, by allowing each of these methods to assist in the search for a way to respond to social injustice, one might find the possibility of varied alternatives. In order for this to happen it would be necessary to include all four strategies in the search. They must be allowed to interact with each other and the dialogue between them might present helpful insights that could lead towards a solution. No component should be allowed undue power or authority in the relationship, otherwise the dynamic tension between them will be lost. To do as the Evangelicals have done, to give authority to one element in the association, in this case the regenerative method, will result in the denial of the other three components. The consequences of this potential rejection have already been pointed out in this work.
Before going further let me restate the social strategy categories offered by Henry. The first strategy is revolution, the radical change of social patterns and structures in their essential constitution through violence and compulsion. Reformation is the gradual ethical amendment of particular abuses which in turn secures an improvement in prevailing social character and forms, particularly through the legislative process. Revaluation, on the other hand, is the intellectual reassessment of moral norms which, in turn, calls for a higher moral standard in society while regeneration is the "...transformation by supernatural impulse in individual lives whereby the social scene is renewed through a divine spiritual motivation."(3)

The Evangelical approach is an attempt to regenerate society by transforming the individuals that make up that society. It is the contention of the Evangelicals that the regenerative method can, by itself, affect change in society. To that end they have isolated their social theology from any consideration of the other three strategies, an isolation which can result in the tacit acceptance of the present social structure. By approving society as it exists the Evangelicals may short circuit their social justice goals. They may become the defensive bulwarks of the very system they hope to change. Perhaps this contradiction results from the over-emphasis they have placed on one aspect of the social change dynamic.
If the solution to this dilemma lies in the tension between the four social strategies, rather than in the unequivocal acceptance of one of the elements, how then would social justice questions be considered? Basically the approach would be four-fold, that is, one would consider not only the conversion of individuals from the prevalent worldview to a new viewpoint, although this transformation is a necessary step in social change, for it is difficult to conceive of altering social systems without also modifying the views of the individuals in that system.

In concert with the regeneration of individuals it would also be necessary to examine the roles and powers of the structures that make up the society in order to ascertain the extent to which they contribute to the perceived social injustice. This analysis can be expected to reveal the structural change which may be necessary to effect social transformation. In this way one evaluates the need for revolution within the system, that is, the need for radical change in the essential constitution of the social patterns. To some extent this revolution will be compulsory and, perhaps even violent. However, unlike Henry, I do not view the call for revolution as a call to violence, because the possibility exists that essential structural change can be affected without violence. Rather than saying that violence is an implicit element of revolution, I would say
that violence is a relative component, relative to the
degree of opposition that the structural changes encounter.
If the resistance encountered is violent then the revolution
may in turn be violent. Yet this formula is not without
exception. One need only examine the successful campaigns
of Mahatma Gandhi in India and Martin Luther King Jr. in the
United States, to see that revolutionary change can be
implemented without violence. Both Gandhi and King
advocated a non-violent revolution designed to change the
social structure through selective disobedience and passive
non-cooperation. It is from the success of these movements
that one may speak of non-violent revolution which compels
society to change structures that buttress injustice.

In cooperation with regeneration and revolution, the
strategies of reformation and revaluation might also
contribute substantially to the movement toward social
change. Because of the moral bent of revaluation and the
critical intellectual reassessment it advocates, the person
concerned with social change may find it beneficial to
ponder the results of its appraisal. In order to provide
the regenerated individual with a new worldview and the
society with a basis upon which to build its new structures,
certain moral and intellectual understandings will require
reworking. In this way the revaluation strategy may provide
a philosophy or theology which can help to incorporate the
particular alterations which the regenerative and revolutionary approaches suggest into a more general framework.

The fourth area of social strategy which must be integrated into the tension is that of reformation. Through reformation, the gradual amendment of particular abuses by way of legislation (4), the particular structures of injustice can be challenged on the basis of law and in that way can be compelled to begin to conform to an ethical standard which is considered to be more correct than the criterion they presently employ. In this way the proposed solution can be implemented on a judicial as well as a political, ethical and psychological level.

Thus the approach to social change becomes the result of the dialogue between four complimentary viewpoints. It might even be suggested that the dynamic tension of this interaction will be able to avoid the potential difficulties that lie dormant in each of its components. In order to test this it may be helpful to examine the Evangelicals' use of the single element, in this case regeneration, in contrast with the potential application of the dialogue approach.

By pursuing social change through individual regeneration, the Evangelical theology risks isolation and separation from the very society it hopes to transform.
This segregation of theological approach from society then limits the Evangelical to, at best, an indirect influence on individuals and militates against any direct social action. In contrast to this is the dynamic dialogue, which allows all four social change strategies an input. Because of the direct involvement required by the revolutionary and reformation method, the believer will be prodded to operate within and with society.

The regenerative and revaluational emphasis on the individual will be offset by the demands of the revolutionary and reformational strategies, that the larger whole of society must also be considered. In similar fashion the potential for neglecting systemic evil is counterbalanced by the critical approach to social structures which the revolutionary position will bring. Each element in the tension offers a particular dimension which in turn must be considered by the other three components. In this way the potential solutions which might be offered by the tension may be expected to avoid the skewing effect which has characterized much of the theology of North American Evangelicalism.

A point which must be made here is that in order to apply the four strategies that form this tension, the believer will have to give serious consideration to reprioritizing his or her conception of individual
salvation. While not suggesting that the individualist assumption be purged from the theology of the believer, it is proposed that individualism with regards to belief cannot alone provide the foundation for a social justice program. Rather the approach to be preferred might be one which, while accepting the importance of the individual, also recognizes that in order to affect social transformation one must incorporate an understanding of mankind as a social group(s). Thus the believer's social method may include critiques which realize that both actions by individuals and groups should be integrated into the social justice approach.

My suggestion then is that in order to begin to address questions of social justice, the Christian believer, whose faith is based in the individualist assumption, should consider seriously some of the implications which this belief may conceal at present. During these deliberations he or she should endeavour to remain open to the suggestion that their present individualist emphasis may be urging them to isolate themselves from the society in which they live and that it may also be causing them to neglect the power and pervasiveness of evil within the very structures of that society. I also urge them to consider seriously if their individualism skews their social theology in such a way that they are forced to accept their society as a given while
spiriting out of it those few that they alone can reach. If they find that this is the case then I propose that they give consideration to the option that I have described above. They might then approach social problems openly, from an understanding that society is both individuals and groups and that to some degree social change must be perceived as pertaining to a whole called mankind. This view can be facilitated by allowing the four social strategies of regeneration, reformation, revolution and revaluation to exercise their critical functions.

This is but one alternative which I offer, one among many that could be suggested. Future studies might examine this suggested approach to see how well it avoids the hazards analyzed in my investigation of the individualist regenerative strategy. One question such a study would have to consider seriously is that of practicality. How practical is it to suggest that Christian theology maintain a tension between these four diverse elements? Is it possible to preserve such a tension or is it in the nature of religious thought that solutions be mono-emphatic, that is, that religious answers be based clearly upon one particular social strategy?

Another important consideration when examining such an option is the degree of change it implies. To suggest to the Evangelical that a better social strategy might consist
of four diverse elements, some of which require a corporate understanding, may threaten seriously the individualist basis upon which he or she may have constructed his or her faith. Such a radical proposal may so menace his or her belief system that it may result in a hardening of traditional attitudes rather than a serious consideration of the offered alternative.

However these questions must be left to others. I have here offered my thoughts on some potential stumbling blocks which may lie dormant in the North American Evangelical emphasis on individual salvation. I have also tried to show the reasons for these difficulties and how they are manifested in the work of one of the Evangelical writers. Any further work on solutions to these problems will have to await deeper study and thought.

I have begun a very long journey. The road ahead bends and curves. It offers forks of decision and crossroads of judgement. But it leads me to the time when my concern for social justice and my perception of Christianity will be integrated into a clearer understanding of the corporate whole which is humanity. As yet I have not gone very far, but I find strength in the understanding that every journey begins with one step.
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