

FORUM LETTER

Volume 41 Number 8

August 2012

Inside this issue:

Misreading
a controversy

Omnium gatherum

Walking in the light



To walk in the light means that we confess our sins without reserve. Sometimes we do not really confess our sins when we think we are doing so: we rather admit our sins than confess them, and we seek in all possible ways to explain, to extenuate, and to excuse them. We may confess them in words, but in the secret of our hearts we do not take blame; we do not admit full responsibility for them. We think of the evil nature we have inherited, of the bias in our constitution to this or that attractive vice, of the defects of our education, of the violence of the temptation, of the compulsion of circumstances; we do not deny what we have done – we cannot – but we mitigate it by every possible plea. This is not walking in the light. In all such self-excusing there is a large element of voluntary self-deception which keeps the life in the dark. To walk in the light requires us to accept our responsibilities without reserve, to own our sin that we may be able to disown it, and not to own it with such qualifications and reserves as amount to saying in the long run, It was indeed I who did it, but after all it is not I who should bear the blame. A man who makes it his business not to confess his sin, but to understand it and explain it, no matter how philosophical he may seem, is walking in darkness, and the truth is not in him. . . . To walk in the light means that when we confess our sins to God we do not keep a secret hold of them in our hearts. . . . Where there is something hidden in the heart, hidden from God and from man, the darkness is as deep and dreadful as it can be. The desire to keep such a secret hold of sin is itself a sin to be confessed, to be declared in its exceeding sinfulness, to be unreservedly renounced. . . . The man who has a guilty secret in his life is a lonely man. There can be no cordial Christian overflow from his heart to the hearts of others, nor from theirs to his. And he is a man doomed to bear in his loneliness the uneffaced stain of his sin. –James Denney, “Walking in the Light” in *The Way Everlasting: Sermons by James Denney, D. D.* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911), 219-21.

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 \$27.45 (U.S.) a year, \$49.95 (U.S.) for two years, in the United States and Canada. Retirees and students, \$22.00 a year. Add \$8.00 per year for Canadian, \$12.00 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 © 2012 by the American
Lutheran Publicity Bureau.
ISSN 0046-4732

Sexuality partners



As *Forum Letter* readers know, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is in a relationship of full communion with several other church bodies in the United States. Like most Western denominations, our full communion partners have struggled with issues of sexuality over the past several years. One of them, the United Church of Christ, has arguably gone the farthest down the road of sexual revisionism. Way back in 1972, the UCC ordained an openly gay pastor. In 2005, that denomination endorsed the

right of same-sex couples to marry and encouraged local congregations to celebrate and bless such unions. Their General Synod was, the UCC website proclaims, the “first leadership body of a large U.S. church to support equal marriage rights for same-sex couples.”

How large is large?

One must say as an aside, however, that they are beginning to reach the limits of calling themselves a “large U. S. church,” with a reported membership in 2011 of under 1.1 million – slightly behind the Jehovah’s Witnesses. Their membership has declined a stunning 38% since 1950 (that counts their predecessor bodies prior to the UCC’s formation in 1961). They do hold the distinction of having the largest membership decline from 1995 to 2005 among American churches, some 17%; maybe that’s what they mean by “large.”

But other ELCA full communion partners, with some exceptions, are on the same path, and a couple of them have had national conventions this summer that demonstrate where they are headed. Since most of our readers probably have enough to do without following the course of events in other denominations, we offer this recap.

Indianapolis fireworks

No doubt the most dramatic story was that of The Episcopal Church, which met in General Convention in Indianapolis in July. They met the week after Independence Day, but there were still plenty of fireworks.

Of course contention over sexuality is nothing new for the Episcopalians, and because of their tradition as the “elite” denomination in the U. S., they tend to get more press coverage than the rest of us. It helps that Bishop V. Gene Robinson, the first openly gay and partnered Episcopal bishop, spends a good deal of time speaking hither and yon, as we shall see in a moment. (He’s apparently free to do this because there just aren’t that many Episcopalians in his Diocese of New Hampshire – somewhere around 14,000 on the books. Bp. Robinson has announced his retirement later this year, citing stress; I doubt he’ll retire from the lecture circuit.)

The Episcopal Church had already approved ordination of gays and lesbians – officially in 1994, though the first openly gay candidate was ordained in 1977. The formal approval of gay bishops came in

2009. On the docket for this summer’s convention was the approval of a rite for blessing same-sex relationships. It passed the denomination’s bicameral legislative process easily; the House of Bishops approved the provisional rite by a vote of 111 to 41 (with three abstentions), and the House of Deputies followed with an 80% vote of approval.

Not quite marriage

The church is stopping short of calling this “marriage,” though that is a bit of a charade. Formally entitled “The Witnessing and Blessing of a Lifelong Covenant,” the term “marriage” was not used, officials said, simply because marriage is not legal in every state. But the rite contains provisions for exchange of vows and rings, and you know what they say about ducks.

Certain limitations were built into the approval of the rite. As with many matters Episcopalian (and especially with regard to liturgy), individual bishops can decide whether or not the rite may be used in their diocese. There was also a specific “conscience clause” included that precludes any clergyperson or congregation from being forced to perform or host the rite.

Of course the debate on the issue was not without drama. These are Episcopalians, after all. The day after passage, on a “point of personal privilege,” a statement signed by several dissenting bishops was read both in the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies. The adopted liturgy, they said, “is for all practical purposes same-sex marriage. It includes all of the essential elements found in a marriage rite: vows, an exchange of rings, a pronouncement, and a blessing. We believe that the rite subverts the teaching of the *Book of Common Prayer*, places The Episcopal Church outside the mainstream of Christian faith and practice, and creates further distance between this Church and the Anglican Communion along with other Christian churches.”

Walk-out

The delegation of the Diocese of South Carolina went further. They walked out of the Convention and went home, along with their bishop, Mark Lawrence. “We all agree,” the deputies said in a written statement, “that we cannot and will not remain on the floor of the House and act as if all is normal.”

Upon his return to South Carolina, Bp. Law-

rence drafted a pastoral letter to be read in all parishes on the following Sunday. It was a sober and reflective piece, though he himself admitted that even the actions of the General Convention he thought were positive (mostly on some structural changes to the denomination) seemed now “akin to a long overdue rearranging of the furniture when the house is on fire.”

No authority

Bp. Lawrence minced no words about the same-sex liturgy. “Such rites,” he wrote, “are not only contrary to the canons of this diocese and to the judgment of your bishop, but more importantly I believe they are contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture; to two thousand years of Christian practice; as well as to our created nature. . . . The Episcopal Church has no authority to put asunder [the] sacramental understanding of marriage as established by God in creation and blessed through the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. It has no authority to do this either by revising the marriage rite to include same sex partners or by devising some parallel quasi-marital sacramental service.”

Needless to say, the provisional rite will not be approved for use in South Carolina.

Going public, again

There were other fireworks, too. At the meeting of the House of Bishops, the aforementioned Bp. Robinson took the floor to complain about a question that had been asked of him by a media representative. Virtue Online, a traditionalist web site that bills itself as the “voice for global orthodox Anglicanism,” had heard rumors that the good bishop and his husband (they celebrated a legal “civil union” in New Hampshire, but Robinson describes his partner as his “husband” in his official bio) were having relationship difficulty.

A reporter for the group contacted Robinson by email to verify whether that was the case. Now that might have been the responsible thing to do, or it might have been confrontational and snarky; who knows just how the request was worded? Robinson, however, took to the floor of the House of Bishops and cried foul. “I have no intention of responding to that email. It is nobody’s damn business.”

One can understand Robinson’s being peeved, and even feel some sympathy. On the other

hand, there had been no public allegations, so the bishop’s tirade had the effect of making the rumor very public. But then Bp. Robinson is a very public kind of guy.

Sexual anarchy

While it didn’t get quite the press that the same-sex marriage rite got, it is worth noting that the Episcopalians also changed their canon preventing discrimination to include the words “gender identity and expression.” The change, as the resolution’s sponsors phrased it, “is based upon our increased understanding and practice to respect the human dignity of transgender people – transsexuals, and others who differ from majority societal gender norms.” But fear not: this change only guarantees “access to the discernment process,” not ordination.

Bishop Lawrence called this “an even more incoherent departure from the teaching of Holy Scripture. . . . To embrace an understanding of our human condition in which gender may be entirely self-defined, self-chosen is to abandon all such norms, condemning ourselves, our children and grandchildren, as well as future generations to sheer sexual anarchy.”

The Presbyterian trajectory

The Presbyterian Church (USA) also had its General Assembly in July, and sexuality was on the agenda. The results at the Pittsburgh assembly were somewhat different from those at the Episcopal General Convention, though the trajectory seems to be pretty much the same. Ironically, it may be the ubiquitous Bishop Robinson who best characterized the situation among Presbyterians. He stopped off in Pittsburgh to address the “More Light Presbyterians,” the pro-gay advocates in the PC(USA), and in his address he complimented them for having caused “enormous confusion” in their denomination over homosexuality.

The confusion has been evident over the past few years as Presbyterians have bobbed and weaved, first in one direction and then another, on various topics related to sexuality. Two years ago the General Assembly amended the constitution by removing a sexual standard for all ordained officers. In the Presbyterian system, such a change needs to be ratified by a majority of 173 presbyteries, and that happened last year. Specifically, the amendment re-

moved language which required “those called to office in the church . . . to live either in fidelity within the covenant of marriage between a man and a woman or chastity in singleness.” The perceived effect of this change was permission to ordain gays and lesbians in committed relationships, though no such specific standard was actually added at the time. A pending judicial case tested whether the church interpreted Scripture to prohibit homosexual behavior, and earlier this year the answer came back, “No.”

Marriage looms large

But in the Presbyterian context, the question of marriage has perhaps loomed larger than that of ordination. Presbyterian pastors are currently forbidden to perform marriages of same-sex couples. Civil unions seem to be acceptable, but a formal judicial interpretation has ruled that “officers of the PC(USA) authorized to perform marriages shall not state, imply, or represent that a same sex ceremony is a marriage.” Presbyterians are big on judicial rulings.

Of course there have been Presbyterian ministers who have pushed the envelope on this, most notably the Rev. Jane Spahr, a Californian who, during the brief period when same-sex marriage was legal in California, performed sixteen of them. Charges were filed against her, and the agency that had to dispose of the case, her presbytery’s Permanent Judicial Commission, rather begrudgingly agreed to censure her – essentially warning her not to do it again.

Bound by the rules

But they fell all over themselves to say that they really didn’t think she had done anything wrong; it’s just that they had no choice, given the current church rules. They criticized those rules: “We call upon the church to reexamine our own fear and ignorance that continues to reject the inclusiveness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We say this believing that we have in our own Book of Order conflicting and even contradictory rules and regulations that are against the Gospel. . . . We have inclusive and broad descriptive language about marriage, ‘Marriage is a gift God has given to all humankind for the wellbeing of the entire human family.’ This sentence is followed immediately by

‘Marriage is a civil contract between a woman and a man.’ The language of the second statement draws on our cultural understanding today of marriage that is rooted in equality. But it is not faithful to the Biblical witness in which marriage was a case of property transfer because women were property. Nor does it specifically address same gender marriage. Similarly, in the reality in which we live today, marriage can be between same gender as well as opposite gender persons, and we, as a church, need to be able to respond to this reality as Dr. Jane Spahr has done with faithfulness and compassion.”

As Bp. Robinson said: “enormous confusion.”

Election, then resignation

So it was the question of marriage that came to the Presbyterians in Pittsburgh. The fireworks began even before proposed legislation was brought to the floor. Early in the assembly, the Rev. Tara McCabe was elected vice-moderator, the second highest elected post in the PC(USA). But it turned out that she had presided at a same-sex wedding earlier this year in Washington, D. C. The wedding was legal there, but not in the PC(USA), and so, in the face of mounting criticism, the new vice-moderator resigned just days after her election. She was, she said, “saddened by the pervasive poisonous activity” that led to her resignation, alluding to alleged emails she had received. When challenged by the Presbyterian press to produce these emails, she backtracked a bit and said it was only “a poisonous spirit” that saddened her. She was apparently not saddened by the realization that she had violated her ordination vows in performing the ceremony.

But after that drama, there were proposals to delete the language about marriage being “between a woman and a man.” After extensive debate, the General Assembly voted 338-330 to retain the existing language. They did, however, call for a two-year “season of serious study and discernment concerning [the] meaning of Christian marriage.” The purpose, said the resolution, is “to promote the peace, unity and purity of the church.”

Standing at the precipice

“Study” is often a euphemism for “postpone.” We in the ELCA know that from first-hand

experience. The issue will be back at the next General Assembly in 2014, and the revisionist side expects things to go their way at that time. By then more states will likely have endorsed same-sex marriage, more traditionalist Presbyterian congregations will have left the PC(USA), and this year's narrow voting margin will almost certainly be reversed. Presbyterians, you know, do things decently and in order, even jumping off the cliff.

Impending schism

Presbyterians in the United States have a history of schisms and divisions that might rival that of Lutherans, and a new Presbyterian body was added to the landscape earlier this year with the formation of the Evangelical Covenant Order of Presbyterians (ECO). The new church is starting rather slowly, and still only consists of a handful of congregations. As is the case in the ELCA, it takes time for a congregation to go through the process of disaffiliating from the PC(USA) to join another body.

The Presbyterian scene is unfolding in a way remarkably similar to what has happened in the ELCA, however. First there was an organization called the Fellowship of Presbyterians (FOP); that group helped establish the new denomination but remains a separate organization that includes many still in the PC(USA). The two (FPO and ECO) are having a combined conference in August, much as the NALC and Lutheran CORE continue to work closely together.

It remains to be seen whether the latest General Assembly action, or lack of it, will slow the stream of congregations seeking to leave. Some may well see the handwriting on the wall and decide they don't really need two years of serious study to know what they believe about marriage.

And the rest . . .

The ELCA's other full communion partners have also taken recent actions related to sexuality, and perhaps a brief report of where they all are on these issues would be useful. First, as noted a couple of months back in *Forum Letter*, the United Methodist Church again voted to maintain its standards which declare homosexual practice "incompatible with Christian teaching" at their General Conference earlier this year. Efforts to excise the objectionable language have come at each General

Conference since the language was first added in 1972. The phrase originally came in a motion from the floor to amend a statement that was actually attempting to take a more progressive stance; it was approved, and it has remained in the United Methodist documents ever since.

What has kept it there, though, is the unique United Methodist structure which gives votes to delegates from what are called "Central Conferences" — overseas judicatories organically related to the UMC. The voting power held by these judicatories — especially those in Africa — has been increasing because the church is growing there, while it is declining in the United States. Africans, of course, tend to be more conservative on matters of sexuality. Recognizing that the votes for change were not there, the General Conference just never got around to debating other hot-button issues related to marriage (the United Methodists define it as being between a man and a woman) and ordination (homosexual behavior precludes it).

More theological than demographic

The General Synod of the Reformed Church in America met in June, and it reaffirmed the RCA's longstanding position "that homosexual behavior is a sin according to the Holy Scriptures, therefore any person, congregation, or assembly which advocates homosexual behavior or provides leadership for a service of same-sex marriage or a similar celebration has committed a disciplinable offense." The RCA doesn't have African delegates to beef up the traditionalist side, so they must rely on theological persuasion. Still, there are disagreements, and they have now launched a committee to study how best to navigate them — though they are clear its purpose "is not to revisit our stated position."

And finally let's not forget the ELCA's other full communion partner, the Moravian Church. The Moravians have been talking about the issue since the 1970s, but in 2002 approved an open-ended moratorium on any further legislative action. The church thus is living without any official position on gay marriage or on ordination of gays and lesbians. They also have no specific position on the morality of homosexual acts, preferring to see that as a "pastoral issue to be discerned through study of scripture and as the Holy Spirit guides us" (the quote is from a statement of the Provincial Elders

Conference of the Northern Province). As recently as 2010, the Southern Province reaffirmed an earlier statement that “the church should not make a hasty

decision at this time.” It seems to be working for them.

— by Richard O. Johnson, editor

Misreading a controversy

by Art Simon



My summer catch-up reading included James Burkee’s *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod* (Fortress, 2011). I had read excerpts (e.g., in *Lutheran Forum*, Spr. 2011) and several reviews, and I had been interviewed by Burkee while he was researching the book because I played a bit role during my days at Concordia Seminary. I was well-prepared for its chronicling of duplicity, cynicism and sheer worldly power tactics. Burkee does that well.

I was not prepared for one big disappointment, however. The book, as well as the few reviews I read, seem so caught up in the squabbles that they miss the underlying theological issue: the centrality of the Gospel and how to read the Bible.

More than a footnote

I got a hint of this when giving permission to let material from a phone interview be published. I said I’d like to see the text first. Fortress sent me part of a chapter. I responded with a few suggestions, most of which were adopted. One concerned a footnote about an article by Bill Jacobsen in *The Seminarian* (which I edited in 1955-56) on “Luther and Orthodoxy,” which Burkee cited as a challenge to Pieper’s *Brief Statement* and its fundamentalist view of inerrancy. I said that this was not inaccurate, but it was also not the main point. The main point was that post-Luther orthodoxy had strayed from Luther and grounded biblical authority in an inerrant Scripture rather than in the saving work of Christ. Burkee adjusted the footnote—but the book as a whole largely ignores the fact that the moderates’ discomfort with inerrancy stemmed from their wanting to anchor the Bible’s authority in its central purpose: the Gospel. As we sing in the *Lutheran Service Book* liturgy, “These things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (John 20.31).

That makes me wonder: If Burkee didn’t get this (or didn’t think it important enough to feature

in the book), no wonder so many pastors and lay people in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod didn’t get it either, but saw only an argument between liberals and conservatives. In that case the major weakness of the moderates may have been failure to mount a sufficiently clear and positive campaign saying, “Hey, we are upholding the Gospel against an un-Lutheran form of legalism.” That’s a strong, persuasive position. Moderates tried to make that case, of course, and some did so eloquently. But I doubt that the message ever became clear to most Missourians. Alarmists aroused widespread fear by framing the debate as a struggle between Bible-believing conservatives and heresy-prone liberals, when it should have been seen as a debate between evangelical conservatives and legalistic conservatives.

Focusing on the wrong thing

This may be an unfair criticism of the book, which concentrates on the political tactics of hard-line orthodoxists in gaining control of the LCMS, not on the theology and motives of the moderates—a slight that Martin Marty briefly acknowledges in his laudatory forward. And John Hannah’s web review (lutheranforum.org, Jan. 15, 2011) gives a nod in this direction by hoping “that an equally thorough examination of the ‘moderate’ documents will become available. A weighing of the competing theological contentions should be made by someone.”

But the omission of it in this book has the effect of once again focusing the struggle for the soul of Missouri on an agenda largely defined by Herman Otten and others, who were out to rid the LCMS of the kind of folks who, for example, cherish the Genesis account of creation as God’s theological word, but—for the sake of the Gospel—not science.

Art Simon is the founder and president emeritus of Bread for the World, the nation’s main citizens’ lobby on hunger. He is also a retired LCMS pastor.

Omnium gatherum



Guarded communion • I continue to hear from people wanting to put in their two cents on Peter Speckhard's recent reflection on celebrating communion on a Holy Land tour. Some particularly thoughtful words came from Frank Senn, one of the finest liturgical scholars in contemporary Lutheranism. His take: "Moving the Eucharistic banquet beyond the assembly constituted to celebrate it always presents problems. Just think about the social dynamics of blending or merging dinner parties, and then throw theological issues into the mix. Celebrating the Eucharist with only a portion of the assembly/congregation can become an exercise of the *collegium pietatis* unless it is carefully nuanced (e.g., extending the congregation's Eucharist to the absent, as we see already in Justin Martyr). I guess I wouldn't even have considered celebrating the Eucharist with the portion of my congregation that was a portion of a group of pilgrims to the Holy Land. I would have tried to arrange the schedule so that on Sunday morning we could be guests at the Eucharist of a local assembly/congregation, perhaps in this case the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer in Jerusalem's Old City (which also has an early English language service) or Christmas Lutheran Church in Bethlehem. This would have had the added benefit of enabling my church members to sample the ongoing life of the church in present day Israel/Palestine. And if communing with such congregations posed issues of Eucharistic fellowship, then attend anyway and lament with repentance the fractured body of Christ even in the Lutheran family while also witnessing with thanksgiving the ongoing life of the church in the Holy Land."

Piepkorn on church architecture • The prolific Arthur Carl Piepkorn wrote a lengthy monograph in 1963 entitled *The Architectural Requirements of the Lutheran Cultus*, and it is now being made available by Philip James Secker, the student of Piepkorn who has dedicated himself to fostering the professor's legacy. Piepkorn was perhaps too much of an antiquarian to be widely popular today, but his writing was always scholarly, well-informed, and ultimately helpful (whether or not one follows him the whole

way). He can also be pretty funny, in a dry sort of manner. For example, in discussing altar rails, he notes that they are a recent invention and not really necessary; but if you're going to have them, "the anatomical structure of users must be considered" (by which he means the kneelers must not be too high). Furthermore, the rail shouldn't "extend solidly across the chancel" — though "any kind of gate arrangement is quite unnecessary and is likely to be a nuisance." Piepkorn was also an advocate of the celebrant "facing the people" — an argument he seems to have won, but Secker and others think he may have had a different view if he were writing today, based on newer research into early church practices. Along with Piepkorn's essay comes an index and an introduction where this issue is discussed briefly by Charles McClean. All in all, this is a useful piece of work. You can order a free pdf copy from Secker at psecker@snet.net. The price is right, and I recommend it.

Episcopalians and baptism • When they weren't debating sexuality, the Episcopalians at their General Convention talked about whether to officially allow the unbaptized to receive the Eucharist. In the end, the bishops quashed the idea, though the final wording which refers to baptism as the "ancient and normative entry point to receiving Holy Communion" was seen by at least some conservative Episcopalians as the camel's nose under the tent. Those advocating for changing the canon made a familiar sounding argument: "In recent decades the Episcopal Church, with prayerful consideration and deliberation, has consistently moved to being a more inclusive, open and welcoming member of Christ's Body. Such grace is riveted on the teachings and actions of Jesus and the compassionate embrace he had for all." Well, see, there actually is a connection between debates about baptism/Eucharist and sexuality.

One more reason • File this under "one more reason to be annoyed at *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*." Or maybe at sundaysandseasons.com. Or both. I have enough annoyance to go around. I've always appreciated Lloyd Stone's hymn "This Is My

Song" — a lovely text that I've often used on national holidays to sort of redirect people's patriotic fervor away from the jingoistic "we're better than any other nation in the world." The hymn isn't specifically Christian, which should normally make one shy away from singing it in worship. But the Methodist theologian Georgia Harkness contributed an additional verse that adds a more religious, even Christological, cast to the text — and very gracefully; one can hardly notice the difference in authorship.

(Though I actually found a blogger who loves the hymn but calls Harkness's words "the harsh intrusion of Christian theology," and he doesn't mean that in a good way.) I was pleased when I saw that the hymn was included in *ELW*, and therefore available at s&s.com. I duly plopped it into the liturgy as the closing hymn on the Sunday closest to Independence Day. But when we sang it in church, I was astonished to discover that Harkness's verse had been dechristianized. *ELW* has made two changes. In the first line, "O Lord of all earth's kingdoms" becomes "O God of all earth's kingdoms." Okay, I get the "masculine language" thing (even if I don't like it), and the change doesn't undermine either the poetry or the content; at least they don't try to make us sing "realms" across two notes. But then in the third line, Harkness's prayer "Let Christ be lifted up till all shall serve him" becomes "O God, be lifted up till all shall serve you." That excises the only reference to Christ and makes this a nice generic song that could be sung by Unitarians or Unity adherents or Latter Day Saints; it also destroys the Biblical allusion to the Son of Man being lifted up. And to what end? To avoid referring to Christ as "him"? Or just

to avoid Christ? Then, to add insult to injury, the editors don't even acknowledge our old friend "alt." at the bottom, to tip us off that someone's been altering the author's work. Georgia Harkness was an ethicist. I can't imagine she would have been pleased at any of the above. So yes, I'm annoyed. I'm also annoyed at myself for not looking closely at every word in a file downloaded from s&s.com. I should know better by now.

Politics • I've had a couple of amusing responses to my offer last time to pass on information about "Republicans for Obamacare," should such an organization exist. At most of them I'll just chuckle privately, but one of them I must share. Stop reading now if you are a Republican who is easily offended. One reader wrote, "As for whether or not there are any Republicans for Obamacare? Yes, his name is Mitt Romney and he invented it." Sorry, I couldn't help myself.

Marital strife • I've had some people tell me that *Forum Letter* is the cause of marital conflict in their households, as there is a monthly struggle over which spouse gets to read it first. The solution, as is often the case in such situations, seems obvious, at least to an outsider: Buy your spouse his or her own subscription as a birthday or anniversary present. If you asked Donna in the ALPB office, she might even produce a fancy "you have been given a gift subscription by your beloved" form letter. If she doesn't, I will. And with two copies in the household, you will feel even freer to share *Forum Letter* with your friends.

—roj

Address Service Requested

DELHI, NY 13753-0327
POST OFFICE BOX 327

LUTHERAN FORUM / FORUM LETTER
AMERICAN LUTHERAN PUBLICITY BUREAU

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
MASON CITY, IA 50401
ALPB