

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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



BULLETIN VOL 4 No. 1
by TSF NEWS & REVIEWS
Edited by Theological Students Fellowship
3 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703

Mark Lau Branson
(TSF General Secretary)
Editors: Clark H. Pinnock
(Toronto School of Theology)
Paul A. Mickey
(Evangelical Divinity School, on leave '80-'81)
Elaine Good
(TSF Administrative Assistant)

Editors: Stephen T. Davis
(Antioch Men's College) *Philosophy*;
E. Frykenberg (University of Wisconsin) *World Religions*; Robert L. Hubbard
(Seminary) *Old Testament*; Richard
(Calvin College) *Ethics*; Thomas C.
(New University Theological School)
Theology; Grant R. Osborne
(Evangelical Divinity School) *New Testament*;
Donald Tinder (New College, Ontario)
Church History; Keith Vandell
(University of Wisconsin) *World Religions*.

Editing Editors (Professors): Donald
(University of Dubuque Theological Seminary); Russell Burck (Rushmore-St. Lukes Medical Center, Chicago); Donald Buteyn (San Francisco Theological Seminary); Donald Dayton (New Baptist Theological Seminary); Ellenbaum (College of DuPage); Hurtado (University of Manitoba); Ramm (American Baptist Seminary, West, Berkeley); James Parker, III (Baptist Theological Seminary); Riegel (Trinity Western College, Canada); Gerald Sheppard (Union Theological Seminary, New York); R. Edward Turner (New York University Theological School); Watson (Perkins School of Theology).

Editing Editors (Students): Douglas
(Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley); Vaughn Baker (Perkins School of Theology); Terry Donaldson (Toronto School of Theology); Kapp Johnson (Perkins Graduate School); Susanne
(Princeton Theological Seminary); Thomas
(Vanderbilt University); Hal
(Boston University); Kenneth Morris
(University of Georgia); Alan Padgett (Drew Theological School); John
(Fuller Theological Seminary).

BULLETIN (Formerly TSF News & Reviews) is published five times during the school year (October-May). Membership in TSF (\$10/yr; \$8-students) includes both *Bulletin* and *THEMELIOS* (formerly *Themelios*), the theological journal of the Theological Students Fellowship of Evangelical Divinity School. Separate subscription rates are: *Bulletin*-\$6.50/yr; *Themelios*-\$4.50/yr. Back issues are available on request. Student rates include 10 or more copies delivered to your address at \$7. per person. All subscriptions and correspondence (except as noted on special order forms) should be sent to Theological Students Fellowship, 3 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. TSF is a member of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship.

CONTENTS

INTERSECTION (*The integration of theological studies with ethics, academic disciplines, and ecclesiastical institutions.*)

Wagner and Costas on Cowe	
Lausanne's Consultation on World Evangelization:	
A Personal Assessment by C. Peter Wagner	2
Report on Thailand 80 by Orlando E. Costas	4
A Report From Europe on the Third Biennial Conference of F.E.E.T. by Donald Dean Smeeton	7

INQUIRY (*Questions, proposals, discussions, research reports on theological and biblical issues.*)

A Report on Paul Vitz's Lecture "From a Secular to a Christian Psychology" by Mark Lau Branson	7
--	---

ACADEME (*Reports from seminary classrooms, special events and TSF chapters.*)

A Sample Constitution of the Evangelical Students Union	8
---	---

SPIRITUAL FORMATION (*Probing questions, suggestions, encouragement in areas of personal/spiritual growth.*)

Seasons of Prayer by Gregory A. Youngchild	9
--	---

REVIEWS (*Notes and critiques on recent books and periodicals.*)

Noteworthy Articles	11
Book Reviews (itemized on back cover)	13

groups of our planet will be reached with the Gospel message and will be part of that "great multitude which no man could number of all nations and kindreds, and peoples and tongues" standing before the throne and praising God in the last days.

[Published concurrently in *Global Church Growth Bulletin* Copyright 1980. Reprinted with permission.]

REPORT ON THAILAND 80 (CONSULTATION ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION)

By Orlando E. Costas

As a member of the LCWE working group on Theology and Education, I was aware of the process and the issues at stake in the recent COWE meeting. Thailand's theme was taken from the Epistle to the Romans (10:14): "How Shall They Hear?" Contary to Melbourne, the theme of which ("Your Kingdom Come") was expressed in "Jesus language," Thailand's theme represented "Pauline language," which is expository and deductive rather than narrative and inductive, conceptual and argumentative instead of symbolic and descriptive. The Consultation did not study the theme in inductive Bible studies but in deductive theological expositions on the implications of the theme. It began with a keynote address and was followed by a series of plenary addresses on the God who speaks, the Word God has spoken and the People to whom God speaks.

Thailand 80 was pricked by the awareness of a tragic reality: an explosive world population of over 4 billion people, with almost 80% who lie beyond the frontiers of the gospel and the actual reach of any church or individual Christians. Its theme reflected a passionate concern for the salvation of billions who have not had the opportunity to hear the gospel and consider it as a personal option for their lives. It not only underscored the fact that God speaks (Heb. 1:1) but also that Jesus Christ is God's saving word for humankind (Rom. 10:9). Without him, women and men are lost in sin (Rom. 3:10ff). Hence Thailand's theological focus was on Christ and salvation.

The Consultation was structured around 17 mini-consultations dealing with different "people-groups." Among the 17 people groups were marxists, secularists, Hindus, Muslims, traditional religionists, large city dwellers, urban poor and refugees. The mini-consultations worked under the premise that since the majority of the people of the world are not within the reach of local churches, specialized agents (cross-cultural) are needed for their evangelization. Each consultation produced an elaborate report outlining the characteristics of its respective people group, and the opportunities, problems and resources to reach its members with the gospel.

Alongside the mini-consultations, there was a special commission selected from rank and file evangelical leaders around the world that worked on the problem of evangelical cooperation. The situation was especially provoked by the growing tensions, on the one hand, between some established evangelicals from North America and Europe and progressive evangelicals from the same part of the world, like John Stott and Waldron Scott (General Secretary of the World Evangelical Fellowship), and Third World evangelical leaders. This had been dramatically expressed in Arthur Johnson's controversial book, *The Battle for World Evangelization* (Tyndale, 1978) and John Stott's response in *Christianity Today*. But the problem had also been intensified by the WEF's invitation

to the LCWE to become the former's arm for evangelization, and the resistance of some North American leaders of the Church Growth Movement and para-church faith missions as well as evangelicals in denominations that do not belong to the WEF. The Church Growth leaders, especially, were afraid that history would be repeated over again by the absorption of a missionary-evangelistic movement like Lausanne into a church-oriented organization like the WEF, as was the case with the integration of the old International Missionary Council into the WCC in 1961.

Ultimately the participants, which we learned at Pattaya were serving as a consultive assembly, gave the LCWE a continuing mandate. It also approved a document on evangelical cooperation, which responds to the invitation of the WEF by stating that it's best for the time being that the two continue to work cooperatively since it is too premature for an integration to take place.

There were four episodes that took place on the fringes of the Consultation which deserve to be mentioned because they had an indirect impact on the outcome and raised some questions on the future of the Lausanne Movement.

A Report on WCC

One of them was a non-scheduled and non-official meeting that was called one evening for those interested in getting a report on the Melbourne Conference. Since the meeting was called for 9:00 p.m., the leaders of the Consultation didn't expect that so many would turn out. Over 300 people came. Allen Cole, from the Church Missionary Society of Australia, and Waldron Scott were asked to give their own impressions of Melbourne. Cole was acridly critical to the delight of some. Scott was also critical but reflected a very positive attitude and empathetic spirit, something that pleased the small pro-Melbourne group and enraged many rank and file "established evangelicals." Arthur Glasser, who had gone to Melbourne as the reporter for *Christianity Today*, was critical yet positive (like Stott) and Bruce Nichols, from the WEF's Theological Commission, was close to Cole. Neither Glasser nor Nichols, however, were asked to speak formally. Emilio Castro, Director of the CWME, who was there as an observer from the WCC, was then asked to respond to the presentations of Scott and Cole. His response was eloquent and evangelistically passionate.

When the meeting was open for discussion, an avalanche of opinions, questions and critical remarks followed. Toward the end of the session John Stott, in an unusual and untypical way, went to the podium and challenged Emilio Castro directly on the grounds that Melbourne had not listened to the challenge that he had given the WCC at Nairobi when he accused the former of not being passionately concerned for the lost. Because the audience was split between those who were sympathetic toward Castro and Melbourne and those who were acridly critical of what went on there, Coordinating Committee became worried and sought to get a formal response from the Lausanne Theology and Education Group (LTEG). Finally, a brief representative statement by Stott was released in the daily communique. Basically non-committal, Stott affirmed concern for the oppressed while calling the WCC to be explicit about world evangelization.

A Statement of Concerns

The second striking happening was the Statement of Concerns on the future of the LCWE that John Gitari, Anglican Bishop from Embu, Kenya, Vinay Samuel, a pastor/theologian from the Church of South India, Andrew Kirk, an Anglican theologian

in London, Peter Kusmic, a Pentecostal theologian from Yugoslavia, Clarence Hilliard, a black American pastor from the US, Ronald Sider, a theology professor at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and myself presented to Leighton Ford as Chairman of the LCWE on behalf of a "grass root" movement of participants and consultants. The statement was first drafted by Africans and Black Americans who had participated in the drafting of the Response to Lausanne which had been worked out at the Lausanne Congress in 1974. It was enlarged by Latin Americans and revised by the six of us in response to the mandate of 72 participants that had come to an informal meeting called to consider its contents. It was signed by close to 200 participants and consultants. In the covering letter that accompanied it we affirmed our desire to strengthen world evangelization, explained that we had no organizational connections but were a "grass roots" coalition and that our efforts were intended to be positive and not divisive.

In part, the Statement read:

"Since the world is made up not just of people groups but of institutions and structures, the Lausanne Movement, if it is to make a lasting and profound evangelistic impact in the six continents of the world, must make a special effort to help Christians, local churches, denominations and mission agencies to identify not only people groups, but also the social, economic and political institutions that determine their lives and the structures behind them that hinder evangelism. Indeed, to be an effective mobilizing agent for the evangelization of the world, the LCWE (as the visible expression of the Lausanne Movement) will have to give guidelines to Christians in many parts of the world who are wrestling with the problems of racial, tribal and sexual discrimination, political imperialism, economic exploitation, and physical and psychological harassment of totalitarian regimes of whatever ideology (i.e., tortures, unjust imprisonment and forced exiles) and the liberation struggles that are the consequences of such violent aggression.

"With sadness and tears we must note that there are evangelicals in and outside of South Africa who claim to be Bible-believing Christians and give implicit or explicit support to apartheid. We recognize, however, that there are other evangelicals who have taken courageous stands against this evil. There are evangelical Christians in Latin America and Asia who claim to be true followers of Jesus Christ and yet give direct or indirect support to the growing number of repressive anti-democratic governments on these continents. There are evangelical leaders in some communist ruled countries who appear to support their governments uncritically, even when they deny basic human rights, including freedom of religion. And everywhere else in the world, but particularly in North America, Western Europe, and Australasia, there are many Christians who support, some directly and others unwittingly, the economic domination of the poor nations of the world by the economic policies of the developed nations and the activities of the multi-national corporations. Those evangelicals that send their support to these practices are a great scandal to the evangelical witness in general and to the evangelization of the poor people of the earth in particular. The LCWE should give guidance on how these evangelicals can be reached with the whole biblical Gospel and be challenged to repent and work for justice.

"Evangelicals should not blindly condemn liberation movements for the sake of condemnation. Rather, they should stand for justice and seek to

give sound biblical bases for the creation of just alternative societies.

"The LCWE should exhort heads of nations and other government officials who claim to be Christians to set an example by being 'just and righteous' in the exercise of their office. This would remove a major stumbling block to evangelism in many countries.

"The LCWE should exhort evangelicals around the world to proclaim the Gospel in word and deed, 'in season and out of season' to all unreached people. But it should do so bearing in mind that the overwhelming majority of them are the poor, the powerless and the oppressed of the earth. The God of the Gospel not only speaks (Heb. 1:1) but sees the condition of the oppressed (Ex. 2:35) and hears their cry (Ex. 3:7; Jms. 5:1-5; Acts 7:34). Jesus himself set the example of an authentic evangelization by proclaiming the Gospel to the poor in word and deed (Mt. 11:4-6)."

Ford invited three of us to meet with the entire Committee. The initial response was cool but polite. Peter Wagner of the Fuller School of World Mission raised the question as to whether I had not gone on record, and by implication many of those who were taking part in the whole "grass root movement," as standing against the commitment of Lausanne to the primacy of evangelization. He argued that I had criticized Lausanne for falling into a "prioritization syndrome" and in fact in my latest book, *The Integrity of Mission* (Harper & Row, 1979), had come out for a wholistic evangelistic approach which in his opinion was a departure from the commitment of Lausanne. I answered him that, whereas I had found the word "primary" in article six of the Lausanne Covenant un felicitous because the previous article (five) speaks of a commitment to the whole of the Christian mission which includes both evangelism and social action, I had learned, nevertheless, to live with that word and had, accordingly, signed the Covenant and lived according to its spirit. Furthermore, my book deals with mission in general, not with the specificity of evangelism. Vinay Samuel and Ron Sider both pointed out that our statement was not based on the missiology of any of its drafters; it specifically spoke from within a common conviction and commitment to the Lausanne Covenant.

I understand that after we left that meeting, the Executive Committee went on to discuss the matter further, raising additional questions about some of us, and especially myself. They did not give us a formal reply, but on the other hand, we did not expect one. What did happen, however, was that the Thailand Statement, drafted by John Stott at the request of COWE's top leadership and submitted to the Plenary with their approval, did address itself to some of the issues that we were raising. Stott reaffirmed the Lausanne Covenant to follow Jesus in loving and serving the poor and hungry as well as in verbal proclamation: "Although evangelism and social action are not identical, we gladly reaffirm our commitment to both, and we endorse the Lausanne Covenant in its entirety."

In addition, it now seems as if a consultation that had been previously called to study the relationship between evangelism and social action may be expanded into the level of a Conference. If this is the case, we may consider the Statement as having fulfilled its purpose.

Statement from Women

The third happening was a statement from the few women present to the Executive Committee. Many of them (and many men) were upset with the lack of

female presence in the program and the apparent insensitivity shown by the COWE leadership toward their own spiritual gifts. Though moderate in tone, their statement turned out to be quite incisive if for no other reason than the fact that it highlighted the statistical reality of the Consultation in relation to them. For example, they notice that while:

72% of all evangelicals engaged in cross-cultural evangelization are women, yet:

58 of the 650 invited participants are women--
or 9%
3 of the 50 members of the Lausanne Committee are women--
or 6%
1 of the 34 members of the 4 Working Groups of LCWE is a woman--
or 3%
None of the 9 Subcommissions or working group chairmen are women--
or 0%
None of the Plenary speakers are women--
or 0%
None of the Bible study leaders are women--
or 0%
None of the 7 Regional Group Chairmen are women--
or 0%

They also noted that:

5 out of the 5 Executive Assistants are women--
or 100%
There are 46 staff women, 18 lay observer women, 28 guest women.
159 of 261 non-participants are women--
or 61%

The women offered several suggestions to help the LCWE "involve women in all levels of the church where they can be vital to the cause of world evangelization making a very special and unique contribution to evangelism."

Again there didn't appear to be any formal response from the LCWE Executive Committee. At least I did not see any in the official *Daily Communiqué*. However, in his closing message Leighton Ford spoke directly to the issue when he acknowledged this lacunae and asked how it was possible that our sisters should not be allowed and encouraged to make their own contribution, as members of the Body of Christ, to the cause of world evangelization. And as if to re-enforce the whole issue, he asked his own wife to lead in prayer at the outset of his message. This was a very courageous and Christian gesture on the part of the moderate Ford.

Latin American Concerns

The fourth happening was perhaps the saddest and most unfortunate. Some 27 Latin Americans (of the 70 that were present), led by two executives of the Luis Palau Evangelistic Team met secretly to consider the possibility of forming a Latin American Association of Evangelicals because the newly organized Latin American Council of Churches (CLAI) did not represent them and was too closely related to the WCC. (The meeting was called in secret because in the Latin American delegation there were two CLAI officers and many sympathizers.) The gesture was not harmful in any way. But one of the executives of the Palau Team took advantage of the fact that he was on the staff of COWE's Information service (there were no accredited journalists at the Consultation but rather the Coordinating Committee chose those it wanted to do the reporting and made them part of the COWE news staff), and wrote a story that was put in the Associated Press telex. Three days later the story appeared in Thailand's leading English newspaper, and a day after COWE's Information Service made the story part of the press release that was sent to its larger constituency all

over the world. The whole issue caused an uproar in the Latin American delegation.

The two issues that were most embarrassing and offensive were the comment on Emilio Castro's presence at COWE and the accusation against the Latin American Council of Churches (CLAI) for claiming to represent the majority of Latin American Protestants. Many of those who were not at the secret meeting and some who were, demanded an open meeting of the entire Latin American delegation to deal with the problem. Some fifty came, including Emilio Castro and the writer of the article. The meeting, chaired by Bruno Frigoli, a member of the LCWE Executive Committee, enabled the issue to be clarified. The writer confessed that the article was his own doing and did not have the approval of the 27 that had met. He further admitted not to have had all of the facts straight as to Castro's presence at COWE and apologized publicly to him. The officers of CLAI made it clear that at no time had the latter claimed to speak for *all* Latin American Protestants. It was then agreed that a new press release should be prepared by the Palau Team executive who had written the article and myself.

The two of us met immediately to write the press release as it was drawing near the close of the Consultation. We submitted it to the Director of Information for his approval. He told us that he had to get the approval of the Director of COWE. The release was briefly modified and mimeographed in the COWE official Information Service letterhead. I was then assured by the Director of Information that it would be put in the Associated Press telex, would be distributed the next day to all the participants and sent to the LCWE constituency, as had the previous one. To my knowledge, no one received it! Fortunately, however, I left Pattaya with several personal copies.

The latter incident marks, in my opinion, one of the lowest points of COWE and reflects its greatest liability. COWE, in the words of an observer, was "the closest meeting" he had ever attended. The flow of information was almost as tightly controlled as that of conferences sponsored by orthodox Communist organizations! And the way that the COWE Information Service so eagerly dispatched the news of the 27 Latin Americans who had attacked "liberation theology," questioned the presence of Emilio Castro and proposed to set up an anti-CLAI Association; the way it deliberately withheld the one news release that expressed a real consensus of the majority of the Latin American delegation only demonstrates the bias of at least those who were in charge of COWE's Information Service.

And Yet...

But thanks be to God that no man or woman can define the agenda of the Holy Spirit nor control the power of God's kingdom. And so it was with COWE: God's word was spoken and heard. The Thailand Statement represents a positive word in a negative milieu. And the Lausanne Movement, despite the attempts on the part of some evangelicals to control it ideologically, at the exclusion of others who may not agree with them, continues to be a mobilizing force in the evangelical household, calling the *entire* evangelical family to pray, plan and work for the evangelization of the billions that have still to hear the good news of salvation.

Note: Shortly after completing this report, I received a memo from John Stott to the members of the (now extinct) Lausanne Theology and Education Group. In this memo, Stott reports the formal response of the LCWE, which met after COWE, to con-

ider, among other things, the Statement of Concerns. The LCWE passed the following motion:

The Theological Commission recommends to the WEF that an approach be made to the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization that the function of the Lausanne Theology and Education Group be united with the work of the WEF Theological Commission so as to have one international theological Commission in order to serve the concerns of both the LCWE and the WEF."

A REPORT FROM EUROPE ON THE THIRD BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF F.E.E.T.

by Donald Dean Smeeton

Theology cannot escape the paradoxical. In recent years, Germany has not been known for its evangelical theology, yet Wölmersen, West Germany was the site for the August 25-29 third biennial conference of the Fellowship of European Evangelical Theologians. The Advisory Council of F.E.E.T. consists of: Peter Beyerhaus (Germany), though he attended only the first conference in 1976; Prof. Henri Blocher (France); Dr. Josip Borak (Yugoslavia); Dr. Klass Runia (Holland); Rev. John Stott (Great Britain); Bishop Erling Itnes (Norway) and Mr. José Grau (Spain). The Executive Committee consists of: Mr. Martin Goldsmith (Great Britain), Prof. Howard Marshall (Great Britain), Mr. Siegfried Liebschner (Germany), Dr. Peter Kuzmič (Yugoslavia), Dr. Peter Jones (France), Dr. Agne Nordlander (Sweden), Dr. Klass Runia (Holland) and Rev. Neil Britton (Switzerland).

Although reflective theologians are not always on the best terms with aggressive evangelists, the meetings utilized the facilities of the Neues-Leben-Zentrum through the kindness of German's best known evangelist, Anton Schulte. The goal of F.E.E.T. is to promote evangelical theology in Europe in a spirit of loyalty to the Bible. This year's conference was attended by about 75 theologians and pastors from at least fifteen countries, including East Germany and Yugoslavia.

The theme of this year's meeting was another paradox: Christology. Or to use the official wording, "Who is Jesus? The Modern Challenges for Christology." With the popularity of a variety of theologies from below and new myths of God incarnate, the twentieth century recalls the Christological debate of the early church. Many contemporary thinkers are of the opinion that the classical answers are inadequate, but the F.E.E.T. participants did not come together simply to affirm the old answers.

The father of F.E.E.T., John R.W. Stott, led the daily Bible "readings" which were really expository messages in the best Anglican style. The chairman of the executive committee, Klaus Runia (Holland) provided the background of the present debate. *Tyndale Bulletin* editor, R.T. France examined "The Biblical Basis for the Confession of the Uniqueness of Christ." And Horst Georg Böhlmann of the University of Osnabrück (Germany) evaluated the appropriateness of Chalcedon for today. The general conclusion of these plenary sessions and the numerous workshops was that even though many of the questions raised by modern Christologies are legitimate, most of the answers fall short of the Biblical revelation. The themes that Jesus was "true God" and "true man" were affirmed in various ways so that the Gospel is that the Son of God "came down from heaven for us and our salvation" (Nicene Creed).

At its business session, the conference decided, among other things to seek ways to strengthen evangelical Christianity in Eastern and Southern Europe. It was agreed to establish a special fund to assist young evangelical doctoral students from these areas, and also to provide theologians in Eastern Europe with much needed theological books.

Europe faces very strong pressures of secularization. Some observers have even declared Europe to be post-Christian. Others say that the land of Barth, Brunner and Bultmann will never again be the land of the Bible, but then God is a God of the paradox.

Anyone wanting more information on F.E.E.T. may write to the secretary of the Executive Committee, Rev. Neil Britton, La Cure, CH-1166 Perroy, Switzerland.

INQUIRY (*Questions, proposals, discussions, research reports on theological and biblical issues.*)

A REPORT ON PAUL VITZ'S LECTURE "FROM A SECULAR TO A CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY"

By Mark Lau Branson

Dr. Paul Vitz, professor of psychology at New York University, is the author of *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-Worship* (Eerdmans, 1977), reviewed in the January 1978 issue of *TSF News and Reviews*. In this lecture he (I) identifies major assumptions that are common to most psychological theories; and (II) suggests creative directions for a distinctively Christian psychology.

I. The underlying intellectual assumptions (seven of them) provide the basic world view, especially the understanding of human nature.

(1) Atheism (or agnosticism) is a normal presupposition of most modern theories. Genuine religious motivation is ignored or treated negatively. Some theories began with those who spoke out explicitly against Christianity (Fromm, Rogers, Skinner); others are simply "functionally agnostic" (Transactional Analysis). "The pattern of priests and ministers going into psychology and out of the faith is extremely common."

(2) Naturalism is a closely related assumption. The working of the mind is within a sphere of physical influences or purely reasoned, observed natural happenings. Even Maslow's "real experience," though often caricatured by Christians, is a natural event for Maslow. Any "supernatural" influence is explicitly ruled out.

(3) Reductionism is prevalent, e.g., "love is reduced to sex and sex is reduced to physiology." Spiritual life is reduced (by Freud) to sublimated sex. All "higher" things are viewed only as results of "lower" natural phenomena. (A Christian would see sex in context of love, love as sacred, marriage as a sacrament.)

(4) Individualism (with the "isolated, autonomous, self-preoccupied individual") becomes the building block of psychological health. Values of family and community loose out. Self-will and self-advancement are primary. "It is most revealing that there is not one major psychological theory of personality which does not assume the isolated individual as the central unit and primary concern of its theory." There are no significant theories of human interdependence and certainly none valuing