

FORUM LETTER

Volume 39 Number 1

January 2010

Inside this issue:

Called to be different 4

That town hall forum 6

Omnium gatherum 7

The American
Lutheran Publicity
Bureau is on the web
www.alpb.org

FORUM LETTER is published monthly by the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau (www.alpb.org) with LUTHERAN FORUM, a quarterly journal, in a combined subscription for \$26.95 (U.S.) a year, \$48.95 (U.S.) for two years, in the United States and Canada. Retirees and students, \$21.50 a year. Add \$7.50 per year for overseas delivery. Write to the Subscription Office for special rates for groups. Single copy, \$2.50.

Editor: Pr. Richard O. Johnson
<roj@nccn.net>

Associate Editor: Pr. Peter Speckhard
<pspeckhard@hotmail.com>

Member: Associated Church Press.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: P. O. Box 1394,
Grass Valley, CA 95945. <roj@nccn.net>

SUBSCRIPTION OFFICE: American
Lutheran Publicity Bureau, P. O. Box 327,
Delhi, NY 13753-0327 <dkralpb@aol.com>
Telephone 607-746-7511. Postage paid at
Delhi, NY and additional mailing offices.

POSTMASTER: Send changes of address
to P. O. Box 327, Delhi, NY 13753-0327.

Copyright © 2009 by the American
Lutheran Publicity Bureau.
ISSN 0046-4732

Listen to God's thoughts



"[T]hrough the words of the Scriptures, the one holy Lord of the universe reveals himself. The God who created you and me, who holds all our lives in his hand, the one Lord who knows us through and through . . . draws near to us and speaks his Word to us through the Scriptures. . . . But it is through the action of the Holy Spirit that the words of the Bible become God's Word for us. . . . It is the Spirit who takes the human words of the Scriptures and illumines them in our hearts so that they become God's Word spoken to us here and now. . . . When we read the Bible, therefore – and I hope we will read it every day – and when we hear its contents preached to us, our task is to listen, to put aside our own thoughts and desires, and to open ourselves to hear what God is saying to us. . . . Do not impose your own thoughts on the Scriptures. Listen to God's thoughts. And do not bring your own ways to the Bible. Open yourselves to God's ways. In humility, in prayer, let God in Christ in his Spirit speak his truth to you." – Elizabeth Achtemeier, "The Holy Spirit" (sermon on John 16.12-15; published some years ago in an undated ephemeral pamphlet by Logos Productions)

Shoes from off the feet



One of the salutary things about the turning from one liturgical year to the next is the challenge of confronting obscure Biblical texts. In the LBW daily lectionary as 2009 came to a close, we found ourselves immersed in Zephaniah, Nahum, Joel, Obadiah – not to mention Ezra, Nehemiah, even 1 Maccabees. Turning the corner into Advent, we came to 2 Thessalonians, Jude, Titus, 2 Peter – books which one seldom encounters if one is primarily focused on the Sunday lectionary.

Yet even in the obscure books, there are familiar passages. Early in Advent there was this from 2 Peter: "No prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by human impulse, but those moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." A familiar text, yes, and one that does show up in the Sunday lectionary on Transfiguration in Year A, because of the reference earlier in the passage to Peter on the mountaintop. Most lectionary preachers, if they tackle it at all, take up the Transfiguration theme rather than this verse about interpreting Scripture. So when it fell to me to preach on the text at a Society of the Holy Trinity retreat, I decided to tackle it.

Theological controversy

Turns out that this is actually a pretty controversial text, both exegetically and theologically. The exegetical question is whether the writer means that

a prophecy is not a matter of the *prophet's* interpretation — that a true prophet simply reports the words of God, and does not try to interpret them; or whether he means that a prophecy is not a matter of the *reader's* interpretation — that a contemporary reader can't just interpret a text any old way he or she likes. Most modern translators and commentators prefer the latter; after wading through a few commentaries, I rather think they are right.

The theological question is more interesting and might be phrased this way: Just how do we read and understand the Bible? It's an issue in the forefront of the ELCA's recent debates, of course, since the question of sexuality often hinges on Biblical interpretation. But I want to resist the temptation to lambaste the ELCA's arrogant action in buying into revisionist interpretations — well, I guess I didn't really resist it, did I? — but instead consider how this text convicts you and me.

Do the dead smell?

The challenge to us — because, above all, we are in bondage to sin, but also in large part because we are all raised and educated in the modern world — is to find a way to read Scripture, and even explicate Scripture, that is free from interpretation — or, more accurately, free from “our own interpretation.” There are some who would say that this is impossible. They are both right and wrong — right, in the sense that we can seldom read and wrestle with a text from any vantage point other than our own; wrong, in the sense that recognizing that dilemma can in fact at least begin to free us from ourselves.

Let me say a word about why “one's own interpretation” is so problematic. It is primarily because our assumptions are so often just wrong. G. K. Chesterton, in his little book *Heretics*, points out the absurdity of anthropologists who say things like, “This or that ancient civilization obviously believed the dead could eat in their journey to the other world, because they buried them with food.” It sounds logical enough, a reasonable understanding. But, Chesterton says, it's like some anthropologist in the far distant future saying of us, “They obviously believed the dead could smell, because they covered their graves with flowers.” What is “obvious” is often not true — obviously!

So “one's own interpretation” is problematic because we evaluate most everything out of our

own experience, which is hardly universal and often misleading. If we approach a Biblical text with the notion that the “real meaning” is what it meant to the writer, we are doomed to fail — first, because we cannot ever know for sure “what it meant to the writer,” and second, because “what I think it meant to the writer” is just a round about way of saying “what it means to me.”

Dangerous passage

And that's the heart of the problem, isn't it? How many times have I heard a lay person say, “But pastor, if it might mean this, or it might mean that, or it might mean something else, then I just need to go with what it means to me.” And of course we pastors are really in the same boat — we just perhaps have a more sophisticated view of the possibilities.

But if we have to give up “our own interpretation,” we run into another brick wall: Who is to decide? The ELCA Churchwide Assembly last summer voted, in essence, that the church can't decide, so everyone's view is correct, or at least not incorrect. Luther would have found that appalling, and yet Luther and the other Reformers didn't quite know how to do this either. Their issue was that the church in their day insisted only one interpretation was correct, and it was that of the church, the magisterium. Luther would have none of it — even “if Jerome or Augustine or anyone of the fathers has given his own interpretation.” It leaves us trying to steer between the Scylla of ecclesiastical authority and the Charybdis of private interpretation.

The perspicuity of Scripture

What, then, are we to do? I am not wise enough, nor bold enough, to have a complete answer. I think there are some benchmarks, however, some guidelines for reading the text faithfully.

The first is to recognize that God's Word is not intended to confuse or mislead us. It is, 2 Peter tells us, “a lamp shining in a dark place.” Sometimes a lamp casts shadows, but that is not its purpose. One who attends only to the shadows is pretty likely to stumble. So the first principle here, it seems to me, is to keep our eye always on what the church has called the “perspicuity of Scripture,” the “clearness” of Scripture. Despite our modern “hermeneutic of suspicion,” it is not God's purpose to confuse us, to tie us into exegetical knots. Luther put it

this way: "If the words are obscure in one place, yet they are clear in another. . . . For Christ has opened our understanding to understand the Scriptures."

Flippantly tramping

That leads to the second point, which is that we cannot understand without Christ. Too often our problem as pastors — and this is a confession, more than an accusation — is that we approach the Bible first as scholars or pseudo-scholars. Commentaries open upon our desk, browser fixed at "The Text This Week," we start by trying to learn what the real scholars have said. Or, if our Biblical languages are secure enough, we start with the Greek or Hebrew text by looking in all our lexicons and dictionaries — to learn what the real scholars have said.

We could take a lesson from John Henry Jowett, the English Presbyterian preacher associated closely with evangelist Dwight L. Moody. "It would be far better," he wrote, "to have no critical apparatus at all, and to know nothing about scholarship and nothing about learning, and to come to the sacred page with the shoes from off the feet, than to go burdened with all manner of learning and scholarship, and tramp loudly and flippantly in the most sacred place." "The shoes from off the feet" — is that how we approach the sacred text? As *sacred*, as holy ground?

This, incidentally, is one of the things I've begun to learn through the Society of the Holy Trinity: to read Scripture in the context of prayer, to *pray* Scripture, if you will. To let the Holy Spirit work in my heart through the words the Holy Spirit has inspired.

We are not Montanists

But that leads, of course, to the third point. As Lutherans, we believe that the Holy Spirit speaks and acts through the church. We are not Montanists, and we are not enthusiasts. Luther's hesitation not-

withstanding, I'd rather read Augustine on the Psalms, or Calvin on the Psalms, or Bonhoeffer on the Psalms, than whoever the latest academic sensation might be this year. I'd rather read with the church, and not with the academy.

I do not mean to disparage the academy. My shelves, probably like yours, groan with modern commentaries, weighty tomes, most of them. But I am learning to take them more lightly. After all, we, too, are modern commentators, in our fashion. We gravitate to the academic commentators because they are like us, just better at the languages. So often when we read them we do just what Calvin said: "we arrogantly rely on our own acumen, deeming that sufficient to enable us to understand it, though the mysteries contain things hidden to our flesh, and sublime treasures of life far surpassing our capacities." The Holy Spirit acts through the church, and it is with the church we must read — and not just the Church of What's Happening Now, but the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church through the ages. There's no better way to set aside our own prejudices and presumptions.

A light upon our path

"We have the prophetic word made more sure," says our text. "You will do well to pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts." In this season of Epiphany, we often sing about light, and about a star: "Songs of thankfulness and praise, Jesus, Lord to thee we raise; manifested by the star to the sages from afar. . . . Grant us grace to see thee, Lord, present in thy holy Word."

That Word is indeed a lamp unto our feet and a light upon our path. Let us come to it with simple trust, with the shoes from off our feet, reading with the saints who have gone before us as well as those with whom we journey.

— by Richard O. Johnson, editor

Called to be different

by Richard John Neuhaus



[We are publishing, apparently for the first time in print, a sermon preached in January 1976, at Valparaiso University on "Life Sunday" by the late Richard John Neuhaus — at that time,

of course, still a Lutheran pastor, and something of a hero to the anti-Vietnam War and civil rights movements. His nephew, associate editor Peter Speckhard, provides the following introductory comments.]

Introduction

My father has a small collection of recorded sermons. He can quote things that the Rev. Dr. Richard Luecke said in chapel at Concordia, River Forest in the late 1940s, not because my dad was there but because someone else thought the sermons were so good that he asked Dr. Luecke to sit at his desk in his office and preach them again into a microphone, which he did, and my dad ended up with a copy of the tape.

It is only because of my dad's fondness for recording sermons that I have ever heard my grandfather, who died before I was born, preach a sermon. My grandfather had won some civic award and was preaching on the occasion of the centennial of Clintonville, Wisconsin, and my dad thought the sermon was so good he came back for the second service with a tape recorder.

A year ago, when we were driving out to New York for the funeral of my mother's brother Richard John Neuhaus, my dad was able to pull out a tape of a sermon he had recorded of Neuhaus preaching at Valparaiso University in January, 1976. He recorded it twice, actually, since the sanctuary proved too echoey for a good recording at the early service so he came back for the late service and held his cassette recorder up to a speaker in the narthex. Thirty-two years later my family listened to it again while driving across Ohio. We listened to it twice, too, since it merits multiple hearings.

Bootleg sermons

A lot has changed over the years, culturally, technologically, and otherwise. For one thing, I doubt too many students are out swapping bootleg versions of chapel sermons anymore. Preaching junkies (if they still exist) can get their fix online, which limits them to recent stuff or mere manuscripts. So my dad's old tapes have some archival value for sermon aficionados.

Valpo doesn't need two Sunday services anymore, not even in the smaller chapel downstairs; the university can no longer plausibly point to worship as truly (and not just nominally or architecturally) the nerve-center of the institution. The cavernous chapel rarely resounds with anything more than echoes of the past these days.

Then again, with the one small service they presently have, I doubt the Valpo community goes out of their way to celebrate Life Sunday in January, which was the occasion of my dad's Neuhaus recording. If they do, it probably resembles something more aptly named "Nuance Sunday" and celebrates how both sides of the abortion debate are right and wrong in different ways. Preached at Valpo today, this Neuhaus sermon would stick out like a

braying donkey with its clarity, urgency, and sense that on the question of abortion there is a right side for Christians to be on.

Shifting amens

But one thing that never did change in this regard was Neuhaus himself. The sermon reprinted here from 1976 could easily be a transcript of a Neuhaus sermon from 2006. Those who think Neuhaus swapped the complexities and nuance of progressive liberalism for the safe, authoritarian dogmas of conservatism simply do not know what they are talking about. His sermons remained the same, though the "amens" stopped coming from liberals and started coming from conservatives.

A note on the sermon itself. As I said, my father recorded both services, and differences suggest that Neuhaus was preaching from notes, not a manuscript. My transcription is word for word, but the punctuation represents my own attempt to render the spoken words into prose. Neuhaus spoke very slowly, forcefully, and dramatically, but in a few places used cadence and inflection more characteristic of African-American preaching.

The sermon: Called to be different Richard John Neuhaus Valparaiso University, January, 1976

Samuel! Called by God . . . to be different. Like Nathaniel, Peter, James and John, called by God to be different in the distinctiveness of discipleship. Like you, like me, called by God to be different. A calling more often betrayed than fulfilled, for in sad and sorry truth if one looks at the history of God's people, more often than not they have been the same, the same after as before, the same as the world they are called to transform. So it has been. But so it also has been in all times in all places that the Spirit of the living God is abroad, breaking through in new epiphanies, explosions of the glory and power of God, helping people to be different.

That we might be different

St. Paul writing to the Corinthians today raises a shocking possibility that we might be different in our time with regard to one of the most grotesque distortions in our world, namely, the pervasive notion that the material things of life, notably the human body, are there simply for utilitarian purposes — to give us pleasure and to fit our conven-

ience. Paul says, No! — as the church, when it has had courage in its better moments, has always said No! to such pervasive and debilitating notions. The human body, says Paul, is the locus of the presence of God. And so he invites us to be different in celebrating the holiness of the ordinary.

The human body, sexuality, the bonding of human beings within the great loneliness of the cosmos, is a sacred event. Archbishop Temple long ago said that Christianity is the most materialistic of all religions, and he was right. As we sang but a moment ago, this God whom we confess, to whom we entrust our lives, is not a God who appeared as an angel or some ephemeral spook, as a configuration of abstractions, ideas, feelings. No, this scandalous God, this odd God of ours, became man, taking everything into Himself and thus redeeming everything. So hard it is for us to accept the radical implications of those few words — God became man — that our ordinary, trivial, itchy, sweaty, smelly, unsatisfactory moment in time is ultimate because the Ultimate, the Absolute, has become this stuff that is us and history.

Radical faith

The radical character of the Christian faith is, in our time as it has been in its strongest and more courageous moments in the past, always to expand our understanding of the holiness of the ordinary, of the taken-for-granted, to illuminate the epiphany of the everyday. Three years ago this week there was a ruling by the Supreme Court of this country that I firmly believe set us on a regressive course — although ironically enough, some called it progress. But progress has always been historically the expansion of our understanding of human life and human rights and the protections which we are obligated to afford the most marginal, the most non-utilitarian, the most inconvenient forms of human existence.

Last year a million, perhaps a million and a half, nobody knows, unborn children were (how can we avoid using the word?) killed. There are those who say that only the person confronting the problem, and perhaps expanded only to women, have any right to speak to the subject. What an absurd, what a sexist, what a regressive notion to suggest that when the least and the most vulnerable and the weakest are assaulted, it is not the concern of us all. But, the court said, these whatever-they-are do not

count under the constitution as persons, and therefore there need be no acknowledgement, no protection by the society. And in that decision Justice Blackmun, whether he knew it or not, repeated almost word-for-word the logic of a much earlier decision of the Supreme Court, a hundred and twenty years ago this year, the Dred Scott decision, in which it was ruled that they [African Americans], too, do not count under the constitution as persons, and therefore the society has no obligation to provide the protections provided others.

The heart of the dilemma

And so at the heart of the American dilemma that has for so many centuries and continues to threaten this lively experiment we call America, at the heart of this racial dilemma lies this same perverse notion that it is possible to define human life in a way that ignores the holiness of the ordinary, the sacredness of the taken-for-granted, and that fits everybody into the pattern most convenient to the majority, and those who do not fit in shall not be protected. Not only the black, not only the poor, but increasingly in our society the crippled, the so-called hopelessly ill, the autistic, the retarded, the uselessly aged — everyone who gets in the way of our pleasure — let us exclude them from the bond of human solidarity.

Thus is the logic of this culture slowly infiltrating itself into the lives also of Christians, who are called to be different, to be different in saying No! to this because we have said Yes! to the promise and proclamation of the presence and purpose of God, not only in the ordinary, not only in the marginal, not only in the unimportant, not only in the vulnerable, not only in the weak, but especially there at the outer edges of life.

There are those who say, "I know. But we are not speaking about life. Not really. We're speaking about potential human life." My God, don't they know? We are all potential human beings. At the very heart of the Christian insight is, as St. Paul says in Romans chapter eight, that the whole of creation is yearning as a woman in labor to be what has not yet been revealed. We are called as Christians to affirm our solidarity within the bond of potentiality, our solidarity across the lines of race, and of class, and of nation, and of sex, and of age, and of competence. Now, if Jesus is right, there is nobody who is

nobody. Nobody so poor, so inconvenient, so ugly, so useless. If we understand the holiness of the ordinary, it has a radical transforming power within our own lives. Within our society, we might yet be again a light in the darkness, the salt of the earth, saying No! because we have said Yes! to the difference of discipleship.

Give a damn

A few years ago the Urban League passed out buttons, worn by many, saying "Give a Damn." An excellent idea indeed – give a damn. But why? Why, really, should I? About that peasant in Chad so far away today, starving to death – why should I give a damn? Indeed, there are many who tell us that both he and we would be better off were there

one less starving peasant in the world today. There is no reason to give a damn unless Paul is right, unless Jesus was right, unless the holiness of the ordinary – that God became one of us to call us to the oddity of discipleship, following the example of an odd God who chose that most unlikely people, the Jews, and sent from that most unlikely place, Nazareth, and did through that most unlikely deed, a cross, show forth the salvation of all humankind. He calls us today, sisters and brothers, to stand guard, to stand guard at the doors of life, at the entrance door of life, at the exit door of life, and all along the way of life, to celebrate, to affirm, to cherish, to reverence, to live for, and, if need be, die for His presence among us. Amen.

That town hall forum



A public forum, says Wikipedia, is "a United States constitutional law term that describes a government-owned property that is open to public expression." A town meeting, on the other hand, is "traditionally . . . a time when community members come together to legislate policy and budgets for their town. However, politicians in the United States have been using the term to represent a forum for voters to ask questions."

The politician

That last sentence about sums up the "town hall forum" featuring ELCA Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson on December 6, the Second Sunday of Advent. It wasn't an opportunity for the community of the ELCA to come together and discuss issues of concern; it was a forum for constituents to ask questions of the politician. When you come right down to it, it was more press conference than either town meeting or forum, though without many of the probing questions often asked by members of the press.

In front of a small "studio audience" at ELCA headquarters (most of whom, understandably, seemed to come from the Chicago metropolitan area) and a larger audience on the internet ("the online video player for the forum was launched

3,148 times," the ELCA news release somberly reported, "with 2,205 unique viewers"), Bishop Hanson was in his element – joking, apologizing for having to turn his back to a portion of the "in the round" audience, staying very much on message, hitting all his talking points.

Don't call yourself "dissidents"

So there wasn't much that was new: deploring the ELCA budget cuts because lack of funds undermines the "vibrancy of our mission"; assuring us that [you name the program] is still a priority in spite of budget cuts; insisting that there's lots of room in the ELCA for those who dissent from the churchwide assembly's action on sexuality. "Don't call yourselves 'dissidents,'" the Bishop pleaded, noting that the social statement and the ministry policies both make clear that there are divergent opinions on this within the ELCA, and all are honored. More than one listener thought this was perhaps more paternalistic than pastoral. "I am a dissident," said a pastor in the on line response arena.

In response to another question, on the meaning of "bound conscience," the bishop said, "I think we have a lot of work to do on this whole notion of 'bound conscience.'" Probably no one could disagree with that, though plenty of people wonder why that work wasn't done *before* enshrining this as

a fundamental part of the ELCA lexicon and policy.

Give the bishop credit for doing his best to rally the troops, and for trying to make creative use of new media; it seems likely, however, that those who tuned in were pretty much already convinced, both about the issues and about the bishop, in one

direction or another. If you're still on the fence and want to participate (your participation will be about as active and effective now as if you had tuned in on December 6), you can go to www.elca.org/townhall and see the whole thing.

—by Richard O. Johnson, editor

Omnium gatherum



Extenuating circumstances • Last time *FL* carried an item about Rev. Margot Kässmann, a German bishop who, I noted, had divorced her husband of more than two decades. I have it on reliable authority that there were extenuating circumstances in this situation which might considerably temper how one views the divorce, circumstances which the bishop, to her credit, has declined to speak about publicly; and this, in turn, has left her open to some criticism against which she has refused to defend herself. Divorce is never a pretty thing; it is often the public face of matters very private. How pastors, and perhaps especially pastors in highly visible positions, deal with their private griefs is a matter of some delicacy, and not everyone will agree, either in principle or in application. Having said that, had I known more about the bishop's specific circumstances, I likely would not have commented on her marital status. "Pop bishop" or not, some things are better left unsaid.

Augustana district • Last time we also carried an item reporting the angst of the Augustana Heritage Association over the establishment of an "Augustana District" by the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ (LCMC). You will recall the AHA thought this was a highly inappropriate use of the name they apparently think belongs to them. I have been informed by someone involved with the LCMC that this isn't quite right. The LCMC, you know, is staunchly congregational, which means, among other things, that they neither create nor name districts. Groups of three or more congregations get together and form themselves into a district, using whatever criteria they like (geography, theology, musical preferences, whatever). Then, if they don't conflict with the LCMC constitution, the LCMC rec-

ognizes them as a district. (The LCMC is so congregational, I'm almost surprised they actually have a constitution, but then that's just me.) So it would seem the AHA protest was not only misguided, but misdirected. They should be complaining not to LCMC, but to the people starting the Augustana District. I think maybe I can help out here; they could go to www.augustanadistrict.org and figure out how to express their dismay. I looked at the site a bit and couldn't find anything there even hinting that anyone was trying to hijack the tradition of the old Augustana Synod. Why, maybe they are trying to appeal to supporters of Augustana College in Sioux Falls, SD—a college, you know, founded not by the Swedes but by the old Norwegian Synod. One more indication that the brand name "Augustana" doesn't belong to any Lutheran group in particular.

All eyes on Delaware-Maryland • The Delaware-Maryland Synod will be the first to elect a synodical bishop since the 2009 Churchwide Assembly, due to the resignation for health reasons of Bp. Gerald Knoche. Both Knoche and his predecessor, Bp. George Mocko, have been among the few bishops fairly publicly planted on the traditionalist side of things in the recent unpleasantness. With the possibility of making a statement of some kind, things are heating up there. An anonymous letter from the "Friends of the Delaware-Maryland Synod" arrived in mailboxes moments after Knoche's retirement, promoting the candidacy of the pastor of the largest "Reconciled in Christ" congregation in the synod. It was such an egregious piece that said pastor sent a letter disavowing any part in the mailing. Another anonymous piece from the "traditionalist side" came out shortly thereafter, suggesting consideration of several names (most of whom, I'm told, had not

been asked if they would like to be considered, let alone promoted in this way). Ah, politics. They vote in mid-January, so by the time you read this, it will likely be all over.

Disgruntled ex-subscribers • Of course we never like to lose readers, if for no other reason than economics. The November issue, and specifically the associate editor's spoof on temple prostitution, has so far led to two readers unfriending us. Both were from Australia. We're wondering if satire is one of those things that doesn't translate well from one culture and language to another, at least down there in the land of the coulubah trees. On the other hand, another long-time reader writes, "In all the years I have been reading the *Forum Letter*, I have never laughed so hard as I did reading your 'Temple prostitution: a modest proposal.' What a hoot!!! . . . Thanks for giving this little old life long Lutheran a fun read." We *did*, after all, warn that the content might offend some readers. But never mind; you win some, you lose some.

World AIDS Day • Another World AIDS Day has come and gone, and probably you, like me, neglected yet again to reorient your 1st or 2nd Sunday of Advent plans to accommodate it. That's what the ELCA really wanted you to do, you know. Right there on the web page it asserts that "ELCA congregations are encouraged to use a worship liturgy the weekend before or after Dec. 1 that was prepared by the Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance." ("A worship liturgy" – who writes these things? And then there's

that very impersonal passive voice: who the heck is encouraging us to do this, let alone why? It's a mystery.) They even give you a link to the liturgy. It's a tough choice, trying to decide which part of this liturgy to lampoon. Let me just give you the opening lines, to be read responsively: "A righteous branch is springing up, surely coming, fulfilling the promise, so all living with HIV have access to health care and live in safety. The days are surely coming. Surely. And this is the name by which they shall be known: The Lord is our righteousness." It was, it says, "adapted from Jeremiah 33.14-16." Loosely, it would seem. Loosely.

Trees • It isn't only ELCA parishes who get to celebrate World AIDS Day, and even find a way to incorporate it into the holiday fun. Apparently the ELCA's California Lutheran University in Thousand Oaks, CA, picked up on the seasonal fa-la-las, not with a Christmas Tree (good choice in Advent), not with an inclusive Hanukkah Bush, but with a World AIDS Day Condom Tree. It was the creation, a news release said, of CLU art professor Michael Pearce, whose purpose was to "explore World AIDS Day through his representation of safer sex methods." As they say, this is not your grandfather's Lutheran college. The one redeeming feature I can think of is that the publicity uses the word "safer" rather than "safe," though that's kind of a reach in the redeeming feature department. I would say more, but after the kerfuffle about temple prostitution, I think I'll leave it at that. – *roj*

Address Service Requested

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
MASON CITY, IA 50402
ALPB

AMERICAN LUTHERAN PUBLICITY BUREAU
LUTHERAN FORUM / FORUM LETTER
POST OFFICE BOX 327
DELHI, NY 13753-0327