

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 1

Volume 1 • Number 1 • October 1977

Evangelical Review of Theology

*A digest of articles and book reviews selected from
publications worldwide for an international
readership, interpreting the Christian Faith for
contemporary living.*

The articles in the EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY are the opinions of the authors and reviewers, and do not necessarily represent those of the Editor or the publishers.

Copyright 1977 by the World Evangelical Fellowship.

disaster a mark of his wrath or judgement. The Psalmist and Job wrestled with that problem at a personal level. The resolution of that perplexity is only glimpsed in the Cross.

On the national level, though there is now no nation which has inherited Israel's favoured position, the same moral principles as were revealed in her history may be used in spelling out national [p. 93](#) obligations. We can with confidence affirm certain obligations—the challenges to humanity and justice, to obedience to the divine law and to responsibility. We can announce the warnings of Scripture, and assert the ruin eventually brought about by transgression. Thankfulness for blessings and deliverances, just and compassionate use of power and resources, persistent self-examination in disaster or breakdown—these are universal duties. We shall not be able to interpret the finger of God in every event. Only as the great end-event approaches will there be seen certain recognizable signs among the nations—increasing tumult, war and famine, earthquakes and persecution, false prophets and cold hearts—and the universal preaching of the Gospel ([Matthew 24:3–14](#)) to all nations. Thereafter the mystery of iniquity will be revealed before the final day ([II Thessalonians 2:1–12](#)). This is no timetable, but again—as is the general doctrine of providence itself—a general view of history to be received by faith and used as a stimulus to faithful testimony and perseverance.

Christian prayer is therefore not that we should *know* what God is doing or will do with any nation or nations. It is rather an asking for the eye of faith to discern *my* duty—or the Church's duty—in whatever nation we find ourselves. Nations favoured with centuries of literacy and a Bible in the language of the people, a long history of Gospel preaching, a series of revivals, etc. will surely bear greater responsibilities in view of the privileges they have enjoyed. Some individuals may be called to positions of power at crucial junctures, like Daniel and Joseph, even in pagan nations. All Christians can and should pray for their rulers, as [I Timothy 2:1–2](#) reminds us to do so forcefully. And in those prayers we may often find ourselves wrestling, not with flesh and blood, but with darker and more mysterious forces—spiritual beings associated with particular nations, as the book of Daniel hints ([10:13, 20–21](#)). If the duty of prayer for the nation (prayer which cannot be lacking in penitent identification for our complicity and that of our churches in our communal disobedience) were more widely known and preached, the providential hand of God might well change the direction of this nation, as indeed of any other nation for which earnest prayer was made, for God is no respecter of persons. Providence is a fact that we accept—but only in faith and by faith. Prayer we may not exclude—for rulers and communities. The answers to our prayers we may not always discern. But they *are* answered, and that his hidden hand is upon the destiny of nations—of that we may be sure.

Mr. Johnston, formerly Lecturer in Education, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England, is now Director, Nationwide Festival of Light. [p. 95](#)

Which Way to Utopia: With Marx or Jesus?

by CHRIS WIGGLESWORTH

Reprinted from TRACI-ETS Journal (No. 4) with permission.

BOTH CHRISTIANITY and Communism believe in the ultimate and *inevitable* victory of good over evil. In that sense both point man to Utopia'.¹

While rejecting the way to Utopia charted by Marx and his followers, we would do well to look closely at what they have written. Evangelical Christians are usually poorly informed about Communist teaching and on its theoretical basis in particular. Mao Tsetung frequently quotes Lenin's saying: 'Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolution' and it follows that without an understanding of Marxist theory we can make little or no effective comment on Marxist policies. The following paper outlines the Marxist view of the future and suggests ways in which Christians should react to this—not to score debating points but to examine our own understanding of the future and to help others to a Biblical view of life for their own sake and to be of more use to other men and women.

CLASSICAL MARXIST VIEWS OF THE FUTURE

First, notice Marx writing in 1843 as a young man of 25 about the Prussian state and the German people:

'Man's self-esteem, his sense of freedom, must be re-awakened in the breast of these people. This sense vanished from the world with the Greeks, and with Christianity it took up residence in the blue mists of heaven, but only with its aid can society ever p. 96 again become a community of men that can fulfil their highest needs, a democratic state.

By contrast, men who do not feel themselves to be men accumulate for their masters like a breed of slaves ...

The philistine world is the *animal kingdom of politics* ... centuries of barbarism have produced it and given it shape, and now it stands before us a complete system based on the principle of the *dehumanised world*.'²

Marx saw the state as a perverted despotism which denied man his true nature. Produced by developing capitalism, such a society is bound to collapse.

'The existence of a suffering mankind which thinks and of a thinking mankind which is suppressed must inevitably become unpalatable and indigestible for the animal kingdom of the Philistines wallowing in their passive and thoughtless existence. For our part it is our task to drag the old world into the full light of day and to give positive shape to the new one. The more time history allows thinking mankind to reflect and suffering mankind to collect its strength the more perfect will be the fruit which the present now bears within its womb.'³

Marx wanted to free men from their suffering by showing them the new world which will be born out of this old one, a new society of true community. The way to help is by taking part in the struggle of the poor to exist and in making them aware of how society

¹ Paul Oestreicher in *What Kind of Revolution? A Christian Communist Dialogue* (London, Panther Modern Society, 1968), pp. 192–93.

² In *Letters from the Franco-German Yearbooks*, ET in *Early Writings* (EW) (London, Penguin Marx Library, 1975), p. 201. (All italics in quotes are original.)

³ *Ibid.* pp. 205–6.

is changing. Marx, saw behind naïve Utopianism a lack of realism about the change needed:

‘It is not *radical* revolution or *universal human* emancipation, which is a utopian dream for Germany; it is the partial *merely* political revolution, the revolution which leaves the pillars of the building standing.’⁴

He argued that mere political changes are ineffective, that a ‘*total redemption of humanity*’ is called for; and that the only people who can achieve this are the proletariat, by which Marx meant in particular the urban poor formed by the artificially produced p. 97 poverty of industrialization. They must be taught the way to change things and to hasten the inevitable break-up of the capitalist system based on private property. Beyond this lies the new communist society.

This optimistic vision of a young man formed the basis for the tough-minded programme of the Communist Party in Germany, France and Britain as it grew during the next five years or so.

On one hand, it avoided unrealistic ‘utopian-socialist’ views—as Marx and Engels, his collaborator from 1844 onwards, termed the earlier schemes of men like Owen and Saint-Simon—which though influencing them deeply were seen as outdated in the developing European economics.⁵

In fact Marx pointed out that Communism was not the last word but:

‘a *real* phase, necessary for the next period of historical development, in the emancipation and recovery of mankind. *Communism* is the necessary form and the dynamic principle of the immediate future, but communism is not as such the goal of human development or the (final) form of human society.’⁶

On the other hand, Marx’s view of the future developed the concept of ‘alienation’ or ‘estrangement’ introduced by Hegel and modified by Feuerbach and the ‘Young Hegelians’. In later writings Marx concentrated on the economic aspects of alienation and his popularizer Engels avoided the concept, but a critique of Marxist views of the future, and also of religion, finds valuable points of contact in Marx’s extensive writings before the Communist Manifesto, which he produced with Engels in late 1847 and early 1848.

Hegel had argued that man created himself in the historical process, that is, in the movement of Spirit towards perfect self-consciousness. In this, man came to recognize the creations of his mind as independent or alienated. Alienation referred to the objectivity of Nature, in which the Spirit was alienated from Reason in bondage to Nature. Feuerbach held that man objectified p. 98 his own essence, separating it from himself to make ‘God’ in his own image—a creature become Creator. Alienation meant a situation in which man’s powers seemed to be realities controlling his actions—a projection personified, man afraid of his own shadow. Once men realized this they could restore to themselves their alienated nature as a human community.

Marx went into the social causes of such alienation, and insisted that the State as an external controller of human society is a more fundamental aspect of alienation, as is

⁴ In *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, 1844, ET in EW, p. 253.

⁵ See, for example, Engels’ later comments in *Anti-Dühring*, 1878 (ET London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1935), pp. 286ff.

⁶ *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, ET in EW, p. 358—compare ET in *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, edited by T.B. Bottomore and Maximilian Rubel (London, Pelican-Penguin Books, 1963), p. 252 (B & R).

wealth in the form of capital—‘the domination of living men by dead matter’. ‘Religious estrangement as such takes place only in the sphere of *consciousness*, of man’s inner life, but economic estrangement is that of real life—its supersession therefore embraces both aspects.’⁷ So, man is alienated from what he produces, since it belongs to the capitalist; from his work, which destroys his true nature; from his essential humanity; and from his fellow men in the community.

For Hegel it was a spiritual issue and dialectical resolution of alienation was a question of abstract thought: for Karl Marx, a real transformation of society was called for, restoring to each individual his true nature as a social being liberated from bondage. Marx saw this as an affirmation of man’s true humanity:

‘Let us suppose that we had produced as human beings. In that event each of us would have *doubly affirmed* himself and his neighbour in his production. (1) In my *production* I would have objectified the *specific character* of my individuality and for that reason I would both have enjoyed the *expression* of my own individual *life* during my activity and also, in contemplating the object, I would experience an individual pleasure, I would experience my personality as an *objective sensuously perceptible* (visible to the senses) power *beyond all shadow of doubt*. (2) In your use or enjoyment of my product I would have the *immediate* satisfaction and knowledge that in my labour I had gratified a *human* need, that is, that I had objectified *human nature* and hence had produced an object corresponding to the needs of another *human being*. (3) I would have acted for you as the *mediator* between you and the species, thus I would be acknowledged by you as the complement of your own being, as an essential part of yourself. I would thus know myself to be p. 99 confirmed both in your thoughts and your love. (4) In the individual expression of my own life I would have brought about the immediate expression of your life, and so in my individual activity I would have directly *confirmed* and *realized* my authentic nature, my *human, communal* nature.’⁸

The best short summary of their goals in the ‘immediate future’ of human development was given by Marx and Engels in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Its basic theme is that history is working inevitably for the establishment of the classless society. Well worth reading in its entirety, its message can be judged from the following:

‘The class struggle nears the decisive hour ... the fall of the bourgeoisie (middle-class) and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable ... the Communists have, over the great mass of the proletariat, the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement ... the supremacy of the proletariat will cause antagonisms between peoples to vanish still faster ...

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared and all production concentrated in hands of the vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character ...

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class of the antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all ...

The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries unite!’⁹

Out of the experience of the short-lived revolutions of 1848 Marx modified his concept of a violent conflict issuing in a classless society—the last days became lengthened! In one

⁷ In EPM, ET in EW, p. 349.

⁸ In excerpts from James Mills’ *Elements of Political Economy* 1844, ET in EW, pp. 277–78.

⁹ A recent edition was published in London by Penguin Books, 1967.

of his last works, written in 1875, Marx described two stages in communist society after the coming Revolution had abolished the old bourgeois society with its principle of 'to him that has it shall be given': p. 100

'Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other ... in which the State can be nothing but the *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat* ... (a society) just as it *emerges from* capitalist society; and which is thus in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges.'¹⁰

At this stage, which Marxist orthodoxy later termed 'socialism', the principle is 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work'.¹¹ Marx recognized the 'bourgeois limitation' that such equality only 'consists in the fact that measurement is made with an equal standard, labour' and that 'equal right is an unequal right for unequal labour'.

In *Anti-Dühring*, his classic popular exposition of Marxism (or, as he called it, 'the dialectical method' and 'the materialist conception of history'), Engels prophesied that after the revolution 'the state is not "abolished", *it withers away*'.¹²

That this has not yet actually happened in any of the 'Socialist Republic' indicates a serious and utopian lack of realism but all the same we would be foolish to ignore the fact that a large proportion of the world has already crossed the line from 'capitalism' to 'socialism', usually through a violent revolution, and we certainly should not underestimate Marxism's appeal to the rural and urban poor of the Third World, and to its many frustrated intellectuals.

RECENT MARXIST VIEWS OF THE FUTURE—MAO AND MARCUSE

A hundred years after Marx's predictions his followers are modifying his views, especially as hardened into the orthodoxy of dialectical materialism by Engels, who outlived and interpreted Marx for twelve more years, and Lenin, who began active work and writing shortly before Engels died, and Stalin.¹³

Even 'mainstream' Communists make concessions—James Klugmann, a theoretician of the British Party, after describing the future in slightly updated terms:

'Gradually as we move from Socialism to Communism, as the working day is cut, and machines take from man monotonous repetitious drudging labour, as education extends, the gap between skilled and unskilled work will disappear, there will be no essential class differences between work in town and country. The basis will be laid for a classless society without exploitation of man by man, but with free responsible citizens',

then goes on to concede that Marxists over-simplify matters by saying that a revolution changes man into truly socially-minded socialistic man and admits that this view:

¹⁰ In *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 1875, on Section 3, ET in B & R, p. 261.

¹¹ See, for example, J. V. Stalin's *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed. 1940 (ET London, Lawrence Wishart, 1940), pp. 548–49.

¹² ET, p. 325.

¹³ For Lenin's views, see *The State & Revolution* (ET 1932), for Stalin's see note 11, and also summaries such as that of Roger Garaudy, see note 19.

'... leads again and again to grievous disappointment, because the sins and crimes and selfish outlooks of class society in general, and of capitalism in particular, do not automatically, nor rapidly, disappear under socialism. Socialism only provides, unlike capitalism, a framework within which they *can* be gradually brought to an end ...

Men and women are not 'changed', *they change themselves*. How many Christian missionaries or Marxist propagandists will be able to tell you sad tales of the rapid relapse of those 'converted' in a moment of sudden enthusiasm!

Men and women fully to develop their manifold capacities need a revolutionary change in society. This is true. *But men and women in action, practice, struggle of changing nature and society change their own nature*. And this is a permanent process. It begins under capitalism, continues under socialism, and will continue under communism.'¹⁴

In other words, after the Revolution things will slowly get better as people develop themselves. All that impedes them are the relics of life under capitalism!

Mao Tse-tung also sees a struggle extending into the future:

'Marxists are still a minority of the entire population as well as of the intellectuals. Marxism therefore must still develop through struggle. Marxism can only develop through struggle— p. 102 this is true not only in the past and present, it is necessarily true in the future also. What is correct always develops in the course of struggle with what is wrong ... This is the law of development of truth and it is certainly also the law of development of Marxism. It will take a considerable time to decide the issue in ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in our country'.¹⁵

But Mao is in no doubt as to the eventual outcome; as selections from his famous *Little Red Book* emphasize:

'The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system: this is an objective law independent of man's will. However much the reactionaries try to hold back the wheel of history, sooner or later, revolution will take place and will inevitably triumph ...

We must have faith, first that the peasant masses are ready to advance step by step along the road of socialism ... second, that the Party is capable of leading them ...'¹⁶

The ultimate transformation of humanity may be a mysterious future 'eschatological event' but there is no doubt about the solid hope it has provided to produce action in the present.¹⁷

It is when we look at the writings of another elderly Marxist, Herbert Marcuse, that we see admission of problems in the standard Marxist vision of the future. An exiled German academic who caught the attention of student radicals in the late '60s and early '70s, Marcuse is no longer so fashionable but his version of Marxist future speaks to many Western intellectuals. In his *One-Dimensional Man* (1964) Marcuse was uncertain whether Soviet-type socialism could pass smoothly towards the Communist Utopia without a further upheaval, which might or might not take place, since technology by

¹⁴ James Klugmann in *What Kind of Revolution?* See note 1, pp. 174–77.

¹⁵ In *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, 1957, ET in *Mao Tse-tung: an anthology of his writings* (New York, Mentor Books, 1962), p. 286.

¹⁶ In *Quotations for Chairman Mao Tse-tung* (ET London, Corgi Books, 1967) which like the 'Manifesto' is well worth reading in its entirety.

¹⁷ See Ninian Smart's comments on 'Mao as a religious leader' in *Mao* (London, Fontana, 1974), pp. 83ff. He suggests a link with the Confucian heritage and instead of immortality 'the indefinite interplay of contradictions'.

creating affluence had made freedom from material want into a means of producing servility. In 1969 he began his *Essay on Liberation* on a more optimistic note. Marxist theory had so far refrained from 'utopian speculation' other than specifying 'basic institutional changes' which would lead to a more rational resource-use, reduction of conflict to a minimum and a broadening of areas of freedom. Now this should change:

'I believe that this restrictive conception must be revised, and that revision is suggested, and even necessitated, by the actual evolution of contemporary societies. The dynamic of their productivity deprives "utopia" of its traditional unreal content: what is denounce, d as "utopian" is no longer that which has "no place" and cannot have any place in the historical universe, but rather that which is blocked from coming about by the power of the established societies. Utopian possibilities are inherent in the technical and technological forces of advanced capitalism and socialism: the rational utilization of these forces on a global scale would terminate poverty and scarcity within a very foreseeable future. But we know now that neither their rational use nor—and this is decisive—their collective control by the "immediate producers" (the workers) would by itself eliminate domination and exploitation: a bureaucratic welfare state would still be a state of repression which would continue even into the "second phase of socialism", when each is to receive "according to his needs".'¹⁸

This important recognition that a revolutionary restructuring of economic and political control does not of itself free men from alienation and repression is of course based on the record of Soviet Marxism from the days when Stalin centralized control in 1929. The French Marxist, Roger Garaudy, provides a detailed discussion of this in *The Turning-Point of Socialism*.¹⁹

Marcuse sees the question of what a man really *needs* as the key issue. Not only must the satisfaction of his needs be achieved without exploiting other people but also without continuing the individual's own bondage to a system. In other words, it is not now the system that causes servitude but man's own nature. A qualitative change must occur in the infrastructure of man! Marcuse tries to deal with the vital question:

'Is such a change in the "nature" of man conceivable? I believe so, because technical progress has reached a stage in which reality no longer need be defined by the debilitating competition for social survival and advancement. The more these technical capacities outgrow the framework of exploitation ... the more they propel the drives and aspirations of men to a point at which the necessities of life cease to demand the aggressive performances of "earning a living", and the "non-necessary" becomes a vital need. This proposition, which is central in Marxian theory, is familiar enough ... Marx and Engels refrained from developing concrete concepts of the possible forms of freedom in a socialist society; today such restraint no longer seems justified ... (yet) the world of human freedom cannot be built by the established societies, no matter how much they may streamline and rationalize their dominion.'²⁰

CRITIQUE

¹⁸ *An Essay on Liberation* (London, Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, 1969), pp. 3–4.

¹⁹ 1969 (ET London, Fontana, 1970), pp. 36–7 and 77–139.

²⁰ *Essay*, pp. 5–6.

While we agree with Marcuse that the establishments cannot produce Utopia, we must also ask whether men's needs will be qualitatively changed by revolution and the biological technology Marcuse goes on to mention in his essay.²¹

On the other hand, Jesus talked about qualitative change to Nicodemus in the context of entering God's Utopia, if such is a fair description of the Kingdom of heaven. Christ's analysis has been proved to work in the lives of many individuals but there is much confusion over the socio-economic and political relevance of his insistence of radical personal change under the impact of God's Spirit. It is only too easy for the Gospel to be reduced, especially in the interests of mass communication and rapid consumption, to a private spiritual experience for an individual as an escape from this problem-ridden world. The Church has repeatedly given in to such a diluted approach in its religious activities, often combined with a worldly-wise compromise in social matters.

Karl Marx formulated his ideas at such a time. Especially in Germany the Church was polarized into an establishment organization indifferent to the problems of the poor, to whom Christ was invisible and inaudible, and a pietist movement whose limited contact with the working-classes was confined to offering a spiritual [p. 105](#) refuge to the individual soul from the social oppression of men's lives. Against such a corrupted 'gospel' Marx reacted violently:

'Man makes religion, religion does not make man. Religion is indeed the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet won through to himself or has already lost himself again ... (Religion) is the fantastic realization of the human essence since the human essence has not acquired any true reality. The struggle against religion is therefore indirectly the struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion.'

Religious suffering is at one and the same time the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world and the soul of a soulless condition. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. To call on them to give up their illusions about their real condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. The criticism of religion is therefore in embryo the criticism of that vale of tears of which religion is the halo.

*Criticism has plucked the imaginary flowers on the chain not in order that man shall continue to bear the chain without fantasy or consolation but so that he shall throw off the chain and pluck the living flower.'*²²

It is clear from this classic 'religion is the opium of the people' quotation, just as from the earlier quotes (see refs. 2, 3, 4, and 6–8), that all the time the real enemy for Marx is not religion but the suffering or alienation that the poor endure in a 'heartless world' under 'soulless conditions'. He even implies a concession that religion contains a protest against such suffering. Religion is criticized to the extent that it is indifferent to unjust conditions and ineffective in removing them. Honesty should compel Christians to ask whether this is so different from Isaiah or Amos in God's name rejecting a false and, as such, idolatrous piety which compromised with social injustice as well as private immorality. 'Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates ... seek justice, correct oppression.' 'I hate, I despise your feasts and take [p. 106](#) no delight in your solemn assemblies ... let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.'

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7–22 and also Garaudy's book (note 19), pp. 17–77 for a similar naive faith in technology.

²² For *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, 1843–44, ET in EW, p. 224.

A POINT OF CONTACT

It may be significant that at the very time when some Marxist thinkers are showing up gaps and over-simplification in the traditional Marxist theories of the future,²³ there is a rediscovery in evangelical Christian circles of the social and material dimensions of the Gospel. The 1974 Lausanne Covenant provides good evidence for this.²⁴

A Christian view of the future has to do justice to the material and corporate aspects of Christ's teaching on the Kingdom (itself a political word) in passages such as the 'Nazareth Manifesto' of Luke chapter 4, where such phrases as 'to set at liberty the oppressed' and 'release to the captives' cannot be spiritualized away.²⁵ [Romans 8:19–23](#) describes a freedom from bondage in which the creation groans while it waits to be 'set free from its slavery to decay'. This means we have to take the material world seriously. Again, [1 Corinthians 15:35ff.](#) makes it clear that man's resurrection body is vitally linked to his present natural body, with the implication that we cannot think of saving the 'soul only' or of a future body unrelated to the present life.

To Marx's comment: 'We do not transform world problems into theological ones but theological problems into worldly ones',²⁶ it is no answer to say 'we save individual souls to solve the world's problems'. Even worse is the fascination with prophecy and the Millennium with goes together with an indifference to conditions on the earth now. It is certainly true that all Marxist (or even Christian) pretensions to set up the perfect society on earth here and now by human effort are doomed to failure by the clear Biblical word that the Kingdom will come at God's initiative in God's p. 107 own time. But this does *not* mean that believers are reduced to total pessimism about any social or material expression of God's justice, any more than the fact of a future Kingdom rules out signs of God's rule in the present. We pray for the Kingdom and also work for it as 'light' and 'salt' in the world.

As much as the Marxist, we want 'the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man' and so we will have to be involved with the same practical aspects of alienation for the poor of the world—pavement housing, lack of work in the slums and villages, the oppression of the landless labourers and so on—perhaps alongside the Marxist. At the same time we will point to the deeper sources of self-alienation and the wonderful remedy in the blood of the Lamb.

The poor and oppressed have the first claim on the mission of the Church and the fact that Marxist optimism is changing part of their lives all over the world gives an added reason for the involvement of believers in taking the whole Gospel to the poor as a priority in our work for the future. Faith without works is dead!

²³ Further examples may be found in M. M. Thomas' recent *Man and the Universe of Faiths* (Madras, CLS, 1975, pp. 112–28) with an interesting discussion.

²⁴ See especially Section 5, and also such recent books as *The Great Reversal—Evangelism versus Social Concern* by David Moberg (London, Scripture Union, 1973), *The Politics of Jesus* by John Yoder (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1972, a New Testament study of the socio-political aspects of Christ's ministry), and *Saints in Politics* by Ernest Howse (London, George Allen & Unwin, paperback, 1971) which shows the relevance of Wilberforce's evangelical political action today.

²⁵ See Yoder's book, note 24, for a brilliant discussion of this and in particular the 'jubilee theme' of [Luke 4:19](#)—'The year of the Lord's release'.

²⁶ In *Das Kapital*, Vol. 1, p. 43.

The Rev. Dr. Chris Wigglesworth, a convert from Marxism, is pastor of the Scots Church (CNI) in Bombay. He was recently awarded the MBE for his work in rural development in western India.

The Meaning of Man in the debate between Christianity and Marxism, by ANDREW KIRK. *Themelios*, Vol. 1, Nos. 2 and 3.

This learned article is an opener for all those who desire to understand the real issues of debate between Marxism and Christianity. The author aptly points out that we cannot have a real grasp of Marxism unless we understand Marx's critique of religion, particularly of Christianity. It is only then that we can follow Marxist reasoning and analysis. The author shows how two conceptions of man, that is, Marxist and Christian conceptions, are incompatible on the grounds that the former views man in reductionist terms, whereas the latter sees man as the crown of creation. It is by Christian love and witness that we can transcend Marxism. Marxism has no answer to the problem of evil, and therefore is unable to give a sustained analysis of human alienation, whereas Christians know that the root cause of alienation, whatever its form may be, is sin. Christ came to save mankind from the perdition of sin. Christians need not follow Marxist socio-political programmes, for they have their own programme which is given to them in the revealed Word of God. Those who desire to grasp the real nuances of Marxism are strongly recommended to read this article. p. 109

Present-Day Pastoral Work in Latin America

by PABLO PÉREZ

Reprinted from Theological Fraternity Bulletin (October 1973) with permission.

INTRODUCTION

HARDLY ANYONE doubts that the hour for pastoral work in Latin America has arrived. The information we have concerning the growth of evangelical churches in that continent points to it now more than ever. Large-scale evangelistic campaigns, in churches and cities, the seed that has been planted for more than a decade through nationwide efforts led by Evangelism-in-Depth, the spectacular development of the Pentecostal movement in several countries, and the growing number of believers in the second and third generation, all speak forcefully concerning the urgent need of more effective pastoral work. Moreover, the increasing use of mass media has made the saving message available