
A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSF BULLETIN
THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1984

Vol. 8, No. 2 $3.50

[20] Mk 1:15: Mt 4:23. 9:35. Luke uses the verb rather than the noun to indicate the same message (4:18, 43, 7:22; 8:1; 9:6; 16:16; 20:1). Robert Guelich concludes that the literary genre "gospel", materially speaking, "consists of the message that God was at work in Jesus' life, death and resurrection, effecting his promises found in Scripture." This work of God is "the establishment of *shalom*, wholeness, the reestablishment of broken relationships between himself and his own, the defeat of evil, the forgiveness of sins and the vindication of the poor" (in Stuhlmacher,*op. cit.*, p. 217).

[21] Mk 8:33 and 10:29 parallel *to euaggelion* and Jesus. Mk 14:9 (par Mt 26:13) connects the gospel with his death.

[22] Acts 10:36–43 with 15:7, 13:26–31. According to C.H. Dodd, the earliest "kerygma" began, much like Jesus' proclamation, by asserting that God's promises were now fulfilled. It ended, again like Jesus' message, with a call to repentance and faith. In between, the "kerygma" briefly recited Jesus' life, death, resurrection, present lordship and return— all which occurred according to God's plan, foretold in the Old Testament. In Dodd's view, these events correspond to the central element in Jesus' proclamation: the coming of God's Kingdom.
Although our present, brief reconstruction of the early Church's "gospel" focuses on passages where *euaggelion* or *euaggelizomai* occur, Dodd's "kerygma" corresponds closely to it. In a thorough study (cf note [19] above), the findings of each would interpenetrate and confirm each other. Passages central both to Dodd and to our present study are Ac 10:36–43, 13:17–41; I Co 15:1–7; Ro 1:1–3, 2:16. Other passages central for Dodd are Acts 2:14–39, 3:13–26, 4:10–12, 5:30–32; I Th 1:10; Gl 1:3–4, 3:1; Ro 8:34, 10:8–9. (*The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* [New York: Harper, 1964], pp. 7–35 and appended chart).

[23] Esp. Ro 1:4, I Pt 1:3, Ac 13:34–37, II Ti 1:8; though Jesus' death and resurrection are given equal weight in I Co 15:3–4, the rest of the chapter focuses on the resurrection. Because *euaggelion* involves not only content but power, we also stress its "subjective" effects as indicated from accounts of the early Christian communities' activities (Ac 2:43–47, 4:32–37, I Th 1:2–10, etc.).

[24] Though Dodd acknowledges this (p. 15), Oscar Cullmann emphasizes it much more fully in *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London: Lutterworth, 1949). These confessions provide another means of penetrating to the emphases of the earliest Christian "gospel".

[25] I Th 2:14; Cl 1:5, 23; Ep 1:13–14;; I Pt 1:3–8, 12.

[26] Ep 1:9–10, 3:3–11, 6:19; Cl 1:25–27.

[27] Ep 3:7–10. Thus when Paul speaks of the "gospel", he is frequently discussing his missionary commission (I Co 9:12–18; II Co 10:13–16, 11:7–9; Gl 1:6–2:10; Ro 15:15–21; Ph 1:5–7, etc.).

[28] I Co 1:17–2:6; Gl 3:1, 4:13.

[29] I Th 1:5–7; 2:2, 14–15; Ep 6:15; and throughout II Corinthians. This was already evident in the earliest evangelizing (Ac 5:42) and in Jesus' synoptic sayings (Mk 13:10, Lk 16:16).

[30] My view may differ slightly from Stuhlmacher's, who asserts that "Paul's gospel of Christ is essentially the gospel of Justification!" (*op. cit.*, p. 24). However, Stuhlmacher finds the origin of Paul's gospel in his encounter with the risen Jesus. Since this Jesus was the same one who died accursed by the Law, the encounter convinced Paul that it was not Jesus who was really discredited, but the Law as a way of salvation. Thus from the beginning Paul's gospel involved a critique of justification by works of the Law (pp. 164–167). Even for Stuhlmacher, however, the foundation Paul's gospel is not a general message about justification, but the risen, enthroned Jesus. Justification is an *implication* of his resurrection. Even here the resurrection as God's cosmic act of condemnation and liberation is the foundation of justification.

[31] Brevard Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), esp pp. 44–50. By "unique" we do not mean that Biblical themes have nothing in common with those of other religions and philosophies; but that even a consideration of common elements often serves to highlight the distinctiveness of the former.

[32] By "systematic" we mean simply an orderly, comprehensive, coherent account, employing a consistent methodology and terminology throughout.

[33] G.E. Wright *God Who Acts*, (London: SCM, 1952), pp. 33–58.

[34] Evangelicals have shied away from the Kingdom because of its centrality in Liberal Theology. But the Liberal kingdom was an immanent one. The Biblical notion intertwines immanent and transcendent dimensions.

[35] See Thomas Finger, *Systematic Theology: an Eschatological Approach*, 2 vols. (to be published by Thomas H. Nelson, 1985). Moltmann points in this direction when he says "The eschatological is not one element *of* Christianity, but it is the medium of Christian faith as such, the key in which everything is set, the glow that suffuses everything here in the dawn of an expected new day." (*Theology of Hope* [New York: Harper, 1967], p. 16.) Vernard Eller makes similar suggestions in *Towering Babble* (Elgin, IL: Brethren Press), pp. 65–76 and in the dialogue with Donald Bloesch *op. cit.* (note [2] above).

[36] See Childs, pp. 51–87. A major issue, for example, was that of revelation. What was revealed: historical events? Biblical interpretations of these events? Some combination of the two? (p. 52). This and other issues are still being refined and discussed by evangelical scholars. For another claim that Biblical Theology is not dead, see James Smart, *The Past, Present and Future of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979).

[37] Childs, p. 85.

[38] George Stroup, *The Promise of Narrative Theology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981), pp. 170–175.

[39] Ibid., pp. 228–233. Appropriation of the Biblical narratives as the context for one's own narrative cannot be a passive or merely intellectual act (though receptivity and intellectual appropriation are necessary elements). It means to live— to continue one's narrative history— in a certain way. Conversion (or confession) is real only when it is the first step of a new way of living (pp. 186–212).

[40] For a discussion of the issues, see Stroup, pp. 89–95: and Michael Goldberg, *Theology and Narrative* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), esp pp. 194–240.

[41] See esp. *Character and the Christian Life* (San Antonio: Trinity, 1975) and *Truthfulness and Tragedy* (Notre Dame, In: Notre Dame, 1977).

Is *Sojourners* Marxist? An Analysis of Recent Charges

by Boyd Reese

In the past couple of years, figures from both the Evangelical Establishment and the secular New Right have charged that Marxism characterizes the *Sojourners* outlook. This article will analyze and rebut those charges; more broadly, it will propose other contexts for understanding *Sojourners*. I start with introductory comments, examine evangelical criticisms, discuss the intellectual background and political perspective of *Sojourners*, and finally deal with criticisms from the secular New Right.

Some preliminary comments about the perspective from which this article is written are in order. This analysis will form part of a doctoral dissertation focusing on *Sojourners* written for the Department of Religion at Temple University. I was one of the students at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School who was involved in events leading up to the founding of *Sojourners'* predecessors, *The Post-American*, and served as associate editor of the magazine from 1971 through 1974. I thus claim an insider's knowledge of the development of the political and theological perspective of the magazine in its early days. Almost all of this analysis, however, will rely on material that is available for public scrutiny in the pages of the magazine and in the secondary literature. While I continue in basic sympathy with *Sojourners'* stance, I do not presume to speak for the magazine; the editors may disagree with elements of my analysis.

Charges from the Evangelical Establishment[1]

Both Harold Lindsell and Ronald Nash have charged in recent books on evangelicals, economics, and ethics that *Sojourners* is characterized by a Marxist analysis and prescription for society. In his *Social Justice and the Christian Church* (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1983), Nash cites a statement of Jim Wallis as evidence that he is "one evangelical who can hardly restrain his enthusiasm for Marxism" (p. 158). There is a great deal of irony when one recognizes that the major thrust of the article Nash refers to is a warning to Christians against marrying themselves to any ideological system, and particularly a plea to Latin American liberation theologians to learn from the alliance of North American evangelicalism with capitalism and not tie themselves to Marxism. When Wallis says that it is predictable that some Young Evangelicals will "come to view the world through Marxist eyes," Nash understands this to be desirable from Wallis' point of view, when in fact Wallis attributes this to lack of sophistication on the part of those evangelicals who turn to Marxism! (cf. "Liberation and Conformity," *Sojourners* September 1976, p. 4).

Sojourners has made use of elements of analysis from some Marxist thinkers in its socio-political analysis, but it is not accurate to say its analysis is Marxist, or even heavily influenced by Marxism. Ironically, *Sojourners'* use of Marxism exactly parallels Nash's. In his discussion of Herbert Marcuse, Nash says, "No evangelical has to reject every aspect of Marcuse's diagnosis. Portions of it are easily serviceable in a Christian diagnosis of the spiritual ills of a materialistic society whose every conscious moment is spent in the pursuit and the consumption of things" (p. 99). Nash also discusses Marx's four forms of alienation and says, "The evidence does suggest that all the forms of alienation noted by Marx exist under capitalism"— and immediately adds that they are found in socialist societies as well. He goes on to say that Marx ignored a fifth form of alienation, that from God caused by sin (pp. 135–137). Where *Sojourners* has appropriated elements of analysis from Marxist thinkers (and from other social scientists as well), they have proceeded as Nash does, selectively and with modifications from their reading of the Scriptures.

In *Free Enterprise: A Judeo-Christian Defense* (Tyndale House, 1982), Harold Lindsell charges that *Sojourners* has a thin veneer of Christian rhetoric overlying a basic commitment to Marxism (pp. 30–31). Lindsell quotes from a June 1980 editorial of Jim Wallis that speaks of the present as a period of major social disintegration. Lindsell's quote ends with Wallis' statement, ". . .a system has power only to the extent that people believe in it. When people no longer believe the system is ultimate and permanent, the hope of change

Boyd Reese is a Ph.D candidate in Religion and Society at Temple University.

emerges. Undermining the belief in the system is therefore the first step toward defeating it" (p. 31). Lindsell comments, "Undermining America's belief in the free enterprise system is precisely what *Sojourners* is all about" (p. 31). Lindsell takes "the system" to mean capitalism, pure and simple. I would argue, however, that "the system" in *Sojourners'* analysis is a broader concept, analogous to the New Testament motifs of "the world" in Johannine thought and "this age" in Pauline thought—that present order of things that is criticized and relativized in light of the coming kingdom of God. All systems, capitalist and noncapitalist alike, fall under the gospel's fundamental critique.

Whether Richard Quebedeaux qualifies as a member of the Evangelical Establishment is questionable, but he is a third influential evangelical who makes a connection between *Sojourners* and Marxism. In *The Worldly Evangelicals* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), he stated that of the periodicals of the evangelical left, *Sojourners* was the most open to using New Left and Marxist categories (p. 150). He did not elaborate on this statement, other than to say that this influence included arguments raised by liberation theology.[2] This comment of Quebedeaux's can serve as a lead-in to the next section.

The Intellectual Background of *Sojourners*

Quebedeaux's assertion about *Sojourners* and the New Left is basically accurate, but needs explication. *Sojourners* is to the New Left as the Jesus Freaks were to the hippies. Hippies were generally characterized by their use of drugs and permissive attitude toward sex. While the Jesus Freaks often came from the ranks of the hippies and looked like them, their commitments and morality were decisively different. Likewise, while a number of the leaders of the early *Sojourners* community came from the ranks of the anti-war movement and exposure to New Left thought, conversion to Christian faith led to a perspective that was significantly different from that of the New Left, a perspective that has become increasingly divergent as time has passed.

It is important to understand that the New Left was not a monolithic entity, and that its history can be divided into two distinct phases. This latter insight is of crucial importance, because it was only after 1968 that the New Left came to be dominated by Marxist analyses. The early New Left was an indigenous American radicalism that took its ideals (it was not an ideological movement in its early days) from the American vision ("We hold these truths to be self evident," etc.), and its criticism from the failure of America to live up to that vision, especially in its treatment of racial minorities at home and abroad (e.g., in Vietnam). One of the characteristic commitments of the early New Left was to participatory democracy and making the American democratic vision work for all citizens.[3] As a native American radicalism, the early New Left was more like the populist movement of the late nineteenth century than the varieties of American socialism in the early twentieth century that drew their inspiration from Marx and European experience.[4]

It may be objected that this is a particular reading of the New Left, but the important thing to realize is that it is the understanding of the New Left that fed the founders of *Sojourners*. In particular, it is the vision that Jack Newfield presents in his *A Prophetic Minority* (New York: Signet, 1970 edition with a new introduction by the author), a book that discusses the early days of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Students for a Democratic Society.[5] This is the book Jim Wallis gave me to read when I was skeptical about a radical analysis of American society when we first met in 1970; Newfield's picture of the New Left provided the understanding of the movement for the founders of *Sojourners*.

These comments about intellectual history lead to another characteristic of the New Left. While most of the media attention was focused on the activities of the campus radicals, there was at the same time a significant intellectual effort going on (mostly in graduate departments of a number of state universities) in the production of radical analyses of American society. Some of these New Left analysts were Marxists, others were not.

Those Marxists who produced significant works were what C. Wright Mills called "plain Marxists," those who appropriated elements of Marx's social analysis without capitulating to dogma.[6] These plain Marxists are to be contrasted to dogmatic Marxists, who adhere to a particular party line, e.g. Stalinist, Maoist or Trotskyite.

The diplomatic historian William Appleman Williams is the most influential self-avowed Marxist in the development of *Sojourners'* political analysis. Mills, with his work on the power structure, would be the other figure who would identify himself as a plain Marxist, though Mills' hypotheses in *The Power Elite*, with their denial of a ruling class, and his comments elsewhere about hopes of working class revolution as "labor metaphysic," put his work in direct contradiction to Marxist and other ruling class hypotheses concerning the structure of power in American society. Mills and Williams are the only two figures whose work has had significant influence on *Sojourners'* political analysis who could be considered Marxists, even given this broad understanding of Marxism. Others, like Joyce and Gabriel Kolko with their work on wealth and power and the shaping of the post-war diplomatic world, G. William Domhoff with his work on the structure of power in America, and Richard J. Barnet with his work on a variety of topics dealing with the projection of power of the United States and the Soviet Union in the post-war world, would not be considered Marxists—at least by those who have any real understanding of Marxist thought.

Sojourners' Political Analysis

"Radical" is the proper designation of *Sojourners'* political analysis.[7] This term also can be misleading, because it tends to bring to mind pictures of anarchism and totalitarianism. The content of "radical" as it applies to *Sojourners* can be specified in terms of political analysis and political practice. Components of *Sojourners'* radicalism include perspectives on the domestic structure of power (drawing on the work of C. Wright Mills, G. William Domhoff, and Gabriel Kolko); the military (the central position in the political economy of the military-industrial complex, with the work of Richard J. Barnet and Sidney Lens especially influential); foreign relations (interventionist government policy plus dominant position of the multinationals in the world economy results in a neo-imperialism, with Barnet, Gabriel and Joyce Kolko, and William Appleman Williams influential); racism (as a cancer that eats away at the heart of American society, with Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr., as seminal figures); and approach to social change (grassroots change from the bottom up, using strategies that can include but usually move beyond electoral-legislative politics into such strategies as community organizing, nonviolent direct action, and civil disobedience). It is perhaps indicative of the commitment of the magazine that the real hope for social change in America is seen as coming from renewal in the churches; this renewal is the locus of building opposition to present government policies and articulating constructive alternatives in issues like the arms race and interventionism in Central America.

A good example of the way theology affects political analysis can be seen in the use of the principalities and powers motif in the understanding of political power.[8] Using the work of figures like C. Wright Mills and G. William Domhoff (without committing themselves to either hypothesis), *Sojourners* stands firmly on the side of those who see power in American society concentrated in the hands of a wealthy elite in contrast to the prevailing pluralist viewpoint that sees power diffused throughout competing interest groups, none of which are able to maintain hegemony. *Sojourners'* understanding of the structure of power in American society comes from a dialectical interplay of these elite theories from political science and a biblical picture of the principalities and powers. In *Sojourners'* understanding, structures and institutions of society are subject to the principalities and powers. These supernatural beings were created for human good (in fact, we can't function without them), but revolted and fell, with the consequence that they have an ever-present tendency to usurp God's intended purpose for them and hold humans in bondage to their pretentions to universal sovereignty. The way wealth and power concentrated in the hands of a few work to oppress the many is a particularly vivid example of the oppressive functioning of the powers, especially in the Central American societies that have been the focus of *Sojourners'* attention over the last several years.

The theological dimensions of this analysis give a theoretical depth to the understanding of the problems of justice in relation to power not available in secular analyses. Because the problems are of supra-human dimensions, the situation confronting those who wish to work for peace and justice is on one level even more hopeless than even the most pessimistic secular analysts would have us believe. In understanding the principalities and powers as defeated on the cross of Christ, there is an element of hope for the future "coming out right" not possible in the most optimistic of secular messianisms. It also leads to the understanding that political solutions can never be anything but approximations of justice that are ever in need of improvement because of the tendency of the powers to rebellion. It sees spiritual as well as a political dimensions to the struggle for justice, with praying together one of the most radical political actions people can take.

Secular New Right Charges of Marxism in *Sojourners*

The criticism found in secular conservative sources varies considerably in character. Lloyd Billingsley's "First Church of Christ Socialist" (*National Review* [October 18, 1983: 1339]) portrays *Sojourners* and *The Other Side* as applying double standards in their assertion that "God is on the side of the poor" and in their pacifism, overlooking militarism and abuses of the poor by Marxist regimes. While the tenor of his article can be seen in his use of a parting shot from Malcolm Muggeridge, "People believe lies not because they are plausible, but because they want to believe in them," the article's polemics are based on clear ideological differences and not blatant distortion of the positions of the two magazines.

This cannot be said about a full scale attack on *Sojourners* by Accuracy in Media (AIM), a right-wing media watchdog, and a piece in *Conservative Digest* that twists AIM's already twisted report of the position of *Sojourners*.[9] *Reformed Journal* characterized the AIM study as "too crude to warrant serious consideration" (August, 1983, p. 11). I concur in this evaluation, but the report is circulating within the New Right and readers of *TSF Bulletin* should be aware of the distortions of the AIM report. Joan M. Harris' *The Sojourners File* (Washington: New Century Foundation Press, 1983) was originally published by AIM as *Sojourners on the Road to ...* (Washington, AIM, 1983).[10] Harris' study is a work of pseudo-scholarship. At first glance, it appears to be thoroughly researched and documented. Upon cursory examination, this veneer of scholarship dissolves into a mishmash of innuendo and distortion.

This examination of AIM's charges will first deal with the methodology of the study, and then look at AIM's substantive complaints. Harris' report is characterized by use of ideologically biased sources. Most of her criticisms come from books published by conservative and right-wing publishers, right-wing newsletters, and reprints of articles (Harris doesn't even bother to cite the originals). Of eleven newsletters cited, the only one not identifiable with a right-wing group is castigated as a communist front. Harris' use of Ethics and Public Policy Center reprints and right-wing newsletters represents an attempt to bolster her ideological position by using *bona fide* conservative sources and shows a lack of balanced research.

The main charge in *The Sojourners File* is that the magazine follows the "Soviet party line" on fifty-three topics ranging from revolution, liberation theology, and the PLO to Senator Hatfield, the Super Bowl, and the disabled. In the vast majority of instances, there are no sources for what is claimed to constitute the Soviet party line.[11]

Her use of material from *Sojourners* is equally flawed. The study purports to examine *Sojourners* in depth over six years, but relies on half a dozen issues from 1977 and a baker's dozen from 1981 and 1982. She is prone to quoting out of context and quoting with significant omissions, with the result that reviews and articles with criticisms of Marxism are portrayed as supporting Marxist positions.[12]

These methodological flaws are enough to render *The Sojourners File* unworthy of serious consideration. There are a number of substantive issues raised, however, and these should receive some comment. There seem to be three chief complaints: *Sojourners* has consistently favored the PLO against Israel; it has refused to criticize Marxist regimes; and it is part of an evil network emanating from the Institute of Policy Studies. On the first point, *Sojourners* has consistently championed the rights of the Palestinian people to their own homeland. This is not the same thing as a blanket endorsement of the activities of the PLO (though I would agree that *Sojourners* has not condemned the terrorism of the PLO with the vigor that it has criticized Israeli policies). On the second point, perhaps it is sufficient to say that the *Family Protection Report*, a conservative newsletter, reported that Thomas R. Getman, Senator Hatfield's chief legislative assistant, provided them with a list of seventeen articles published in *Sojourners* since 1977 (the period that Harris examines) that were critical of human rights violations in communist nations.

It is clear from *The Sojourners File* that AIM is particularly upset about *Sojourners'* connection with the Institute for Policy Studies—an appendix is devoted to discussion of IPS.[13] Richard J. Barnet, cofounder and director of IPS, has been a *Sojourners* contributing editor since 1978. Perhaps the easiest way to show that the charge that he and *Sojourners* follow the Soviet party line without deviation is absurd is to look at an editorial he wrote for the February 1980 issue of the magazine, "Two Bumbling Giants" (pp. 3–6), that begins, "The 1980s have begun with the brutal Soviet invasion of Afganistan, ..." Both superpowers are portrayed as out of touch with the yearnings of billions of people for liberation and dignity—yearnings that both capitalism and socialism have failed to answer. Neither realizes that the projection of military power has become counterproductive in achieving its goals. In short, both are portrayed as having fatally flawed, outdated pictures of the world (his *The Giants* [New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977] is a book-length study of this theme). AIM has made no honest attempt to air legitimate differences of opinion and perspective. These tactics of misrepresentation, unsubstantiated allegations and innuendo cut off possibility of fruitful debate.

Conservative Digest (October, 1983, p. 6), reporting on *The Sojourners File*, claimed that Sojourners staff had visited North Vietnam, called for the "right" of North Korea to control South Korea, and supported abortion on demand—none of which are true (apparently support for the Equal Rights Amendment is equated with support for abortion on demand). The report climaxes with an attack on Senator Hatfield.

Why should *Sojourners* be the target of attempted smears by groups like AIM and *Conservative Digest*? Beyond speculation, there are two pieces of evidence. One is to use attacks on the magazine to attack Senator Hatfield. The press release from the National Christian Action Coalition that accompanied the release of *The Sojourners File* in paperback form was intended to discredit the Senator at the beginning of his re-election campaign. A second piece of evidence is the timing of the release and distribution of the earlier spiral-bound version of the book. This coincided with the conference in Pasadena in May 1983, "The Church and Peacemaking in the Nuclear Age," where an attempt was made to distribute the book from the Institute for Religion and Democracy table (IRD refused to allow distribution of the book). Both *Sojourners* and Senator Hatfield are significantly involved in efforts to reverse the arms race. If the right wing can successfully paint them with the red paint brush, then evangelicals will be unlikely to take their biblical arguments seriously.

Conclusion

Sojourners is increasingly recognized as articulating a significant minority position within American evangelicalism. The magazine integrates a sophisticated theological position with a carefully articulated non-Marxist political radicalism. Future critics may be successful in attacking elements of *Sojourners'* vision, but if they are, their work will have to be more careful and more penetrating than the studies explored in this article. These studies, secular and evangelical alike, suffer from a common assumption: criticism of capitalism and opposition to certain U. S. policies are seen as supportive of Marxism and the Soviets. Criticism of the one does not logically entail support for the other.

---

[1] Part of this section was presented in my paper, "The Evangelical Left and Justice," presented at the annual meeting of the Religious Research Association in November 1983, and in a review of Lindsell's and Nash's book in the May 1984 *Sojourners*.

[2] While liberation theology is an accurate designation of *Sojourners'* position (see Jim Wallis' comments on page 3 of the September 1981 issue of *Sojourners*), it is an indigenous North American theology of liberation whose basic stance was worked out *before* the appearance in English of Gustavo Guiterrez's seminal work, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973). Liberation theology did not make much of an impact on the American scene until Guiterrez's book appeared; the Latin American theology did not influence the editors of *Sojourners* in the first few years of the magazine. As noted above, Wallis has written urging the Latin Americans not to make the mistake of tying themselves to Marxism.

[3] Kirkpatrick Sale's *SDS* (New York: Random House, 1973) is the best study of the SDS; see also Alan Adelson, *SDS: A Profile* (New York: Scribner's, 1972). For more succinct studies of the period that put the New Left in a broader context of twentieth century American radicalism, see James Weinstein, *Ambiguous Legacy: The Left in American Politics.* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975) and Milton Cantor, *The Divided Left: American Radicalism 1900-1975* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978).

[4] Christopher Lasch's comments in *The Agony of the American Left* (New York: Knopf, 1969) pp. 5–6 are relevant here:

> Populist and Marxist rhetoric sometimes coincided. The Populist platform of 1892 contained the ringing declaration: "The fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few, unprecedented in the history of mankind; and the possessors of these, in turn, despise the republic and endanger liberty. From the same prolific womb of governmental injustice we breed the two great classes—tramps and millionaires." Some historians have concluded from this rhetorical coincidence that the Populist critique of capitalism, though arrived at independently, was essentially the same as the Socialist critique. (Norman Pollack: *The Populist Response to Industrial America* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.]) This conclusion, as I have argued in the *Pacific Historical Review* (February 1964, pp. 69–73), rests almost entirely on verbal correspondences; it is arrived at by piecing together a series of quotations abstracted from their contexts and treated with equal weight, without regard for speaker or occasion, so as to form a wholly synthetic system which is then attributed to the Populists themselves.
>
> This comment of Lasch's about Pollack's work is a good description of the methods Joan Harris uses in her indictment of *Sojourners* discussed below. There are also parallels between the position of figures like Nash and Lindsell and late nineteenth century movements. Leslie K. Tarr suggested in his *Christianity Today* article "Are Some Electronic Preachers Social Darwinists?" (Oct. 21, 1983 p. 50) that some electronic preachers have mistaken Herbert Spencer's social Darwinism for biblical perspectives. If one takes the capsule summary of the tenets of social Darwinism on page 6 of Richard Hofstadter's *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston: Beacon, 1955), and substitutes "the market" for "nature," then one has an accurate description of Nash's position.

[5] Newfield's perspective is similar to that of Art Gish in *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 1970). Gish compares the New Left to the Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century and finds useful elements in both experiences for Christian radicals to appropriate. This book circulated among those who would become the editorial staff of *The Post-American* fairly soon after they met; I used it as a textbook for a course on Christian social involvement at Trinity College during the second semester of the school year in which we met.

[6] See Mill's comments in his chapter, "Rules for Critics," *The Marxists* (New York: Dell, 1962):

> "Plain Marxists (whether in agreement or in disagreement) work in Marx's own tradition. They understand Marx, and many later marxists as well, to be firmly a part of the classic tradition of sociological thinking. . . . They are generally agreed . . . that his general model and his ways of thinking are central to their own intellectual history and remain relevant to their attempts to grasp present-day social worlds. . . . It is, of course, the point of view taken in the present essay" (p. 98). Mills contrasted his plain Marxists to rigid or institutionalized marxism, which characterizes Marxists "who have won power, or come close to it" (p. 99).

[7] While numerous analysts have characterized *Sojourners* as radical, Augustus Cerillo, Jr., is the only commentator who specified the analytical content of "radical" and authors upon whom *Sojourners* draws (see his "A Survey of Recent Evangelical Social Thought," *Christian Scholars' Review* 5 [1976] 272–280, a condensed version of his American Academy of Religion regional paper of 1974, "On Being Salt and Light in the World: An Appraisal of Evangelical Social Concern").

The most extensive discussion of analysts upon which *Sojourners* draws appears in two review essays by the present author, "The Structure of Power," *Post-American*, January, 1974, pp. 8–9 and "America's Empire," *Post-American*, November/December, 1973, pp. 10–11, 14. See also my "Political Analysis in the Evangelical Left," AAR Mid-Atlantic Regional Meeting, 1982.

[8] See my comments on misunderstandings of the use of this motif in "The New Class and the Young Evangelicals: Second Thoughts" (*Review of Religious Research* 24/4 [March, 1983] 262 and 265n5).

[9] For a discussion of differences between "responsible conservatism" and the Radical Right, see chapter 2 of Richard V. Pierard, *The Unequal Yoke* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970). The tactics of AIM and *Conservative Digest* put them in the Radical Right camp.

[10]. Two investigative journalistic pieces deal with AIM's work, methods, and finances: John Friedman and Eric Nadler, "Who's Taking AIM?" (*The Soho News*, NY, July 15, 1981, p. 10) and Louis Wolf, "Inaccuracy in Media: Accuracy in Media Rewrites the News and History," *CovertAction* 21 (Spring, 1984) 24–38. I realize some would consider the latter article a "tainted source," but I would invite interested readers to compare the AIM study of *Sojourners* with the CovertAction piece side by side and decide for themselves which comes closer to being accurate journalistic reporting.

[11]. There is one Soviet piece on the church from 1982; the next most recent source is a quotation from *World Marxist Review* from 1977. There is one Soviet source from 1965, two from 1935, and two from Lenin. Needless to say, this is not a valid picture of the current "Soviet party line."

[12] For examples of this distortion, see her comments on pages 4 and 42–43 of *File*; for the originals she distorts through selective quotation and omissions, see Wes Granberg-Michaelson, "At the Dawn of the New Creation," *Sojourners*, November, 1981, p. 14 and Merold Westphal's review of Fernando Belo's *A Materialist Reading of the Gospel of Mark*, February, 1982, pp. 37–38.

[13] IPS is a think tank located in Washington. In the twenty-five years since its founding, it has provided analyses of domestic and international problems from a perspective to the left of mainstream liberalism in America. It is perhaps an indication of the quality of IPS' work that it has been the target of a number of attempts from the New Right to discredit its work as Marxist. These attempts have been ably discussed by Aryeh Neier in "The I.P.S. and Its Enemies" (*The Nation* [December 6, 1980] 605–608); another discussion of the IPS appeared in the *New York Times* Sunday magazine: Joshua Muravchik, "Think Tank of the Left" (May 3, 1981).

The Church and Domestic Violence

by Marie M. Fortune

"My heart is in anguish within me, the terrors of death have fallen upon me. Fear and trembling come upon me, and horror overwhelms me. And I say, 'O that I had wings live a dove! I would fly away and be at rest; yea, I would wander afar, I would lodge in the wilderness, I would haste to find me a shelter from the raging wind and tempest." "It is not an enemy who taunts me—then I could bear it; it is not an adversary who deals insolently with me — then I could hide from him. But it is you, my equal, my companion, my familiar friend. We used to hold sweet converse together; within God's house we walked in fellowship. "My companion stretched out his hand against his friends, he violated his convenant. His speech was smoother than butter, yet war was in his heart; his words were softer than oil, yet they were drawn swords.' Psalm 55 (RSV)

The Saturday before Easter I received a call from a colleague who serves a parish in this city. "I have a woman here who has just walked in off the street," he said. "Her husband beat her up. Please talk to her." Clearly, the woman was in crisis and did not know what to do next. I provided her with reassurance and information and suggested that she contact the local shelter for abused women where she could find protection, comfort and time to sort out her options. She took the information and then left with the police to retrieve her son whom she had left behind in her house with the husband she had fled.

Rev. Marie M. Fortune is the director of the Center for the Prevention of Sexual and Domestic Violence in Seattle, Washington. *This article is reprinted from Theology. News and Notes, June, 1982.*

This recent experience gives evidence of aspects of family violence that the church must understand: the church is a sanctuary and an appropriate refuge for members and non-members who need assistance with family violence. For the most part, however, the church is unprepared to help.

Where is the Church?

Until recently, the church has been the priest and Levite in passing by victims of family violence who have fallen by the wayside. The secular community, in many instances, has been the Good Samaritan, and since 1970, has helped respond to the crisis of family violence with shelters and telephone "crisis lines." Often, the church's "passing by" has been unintentional, especially on the part of the clergy. They simply do not "see" the victim standing before them. Most commonly, when asked about family violence, they comment, "No one ever comes to see me with this problem . . ."[1] The seemingly logical conclusion of their limited perception is " . . .so you see, I don't need information about family violence."

Many victims or abusers hesitate to go to their clergy for fear of the response; they fear talking to yet another person who either does not know how to help or whose help may in fact be detrimental.[2] Often hidden from public view, family violence has nevertheless reached epidemic proportions in the U.S.[3] Even good, church-going Christians are not exempt from the statistics of victims and abusers. The United Methodist Church, surveying a portion of its membership, found that 68 percent of those questioned had personally experienced family violence.[4]

Ironically, the church has failed to hear the suffering of violent families because, in general, it has failed to speak out.