

Trinity Te Deum

The official newsletter for Trinity Lutheran Church

1207 West 45 Street Austin, Texas 78756

Rev. Paul R. Harris – 512-453-3835 Church

Sunday School and Bible Study 9:15 AM – Divine Service 10:30 AM

April 1, 2021 Volume 23 Issue 2

April - May 2021

The Post-Covid World

Will there be one? Will there ever be a time when like polio, smallpox, measles, and mumps we'll say, "It's over; we won't"? I honestly don't know. My fear is there is never going to come a time when politics, medicine, and government agree it's safe to start assembling again. So, people will grow accustomed to not assembling with their fellow believers, and they won't see or "feel" what's happening to them. This is the hypothermia illustration. You don't know you're freezing to death. In fact, you start to "feel" warm and comfy. Also is fitting, the illustration of what finally happens to a cherry-red coal pulled from the embers. It turns grey, ashen, and dies.

Believe you me, I'd prefer to remain silent on this, but our Confessional Lutheranism won't let me. I refer to Luther's *Preface* to his Small Catechism which most don't even know exists since in the layperson's edition it's an appendix-afterthought and not an introduction to why Luther wrote his catechism. "But if you [the pastor] fail to urge these things [the benefits of Word and Sacraments] or if you make it into a law and bitterness, then the fault will be yours if they despise the Sacrament. Why should they not be lazy if you are asleep and silent" (pp. 251-2, *Explanation*).

But what if the CDC and WHO and others continue to issue grave predictions, warnings, advisories against assembling because of the consequences to the aged, the infirmed, and even children? I'm no doctor. But see what I'm up contending with our Confessions. Again, this comes from Luther's *Preface*. I apologize for using the "King James" edition, but that's the only electronic one I have access to: "Lastly, since the tyranny of the Pope has been abolished, people are no longer willing to go to the Sacrament and despise it as something useless and unnecessary. Here again urging is necessary, however, with this understanding: We are to force no one to believe, or to receive the Sacrament, nor fix any law, nor time, nor place for it, but are to preach in such a manner that of their own accord, without our law, they will urge themselves and, as it were, compel us pastors to administer the Sacrament. This is done by telling them: Whoever does not seek or

desire the Sacrament at least four times a year, it is to be feared that he despises the Sacrament and is no Christian, just as he is no Christian who does not believe or hear the Gospel; for Christ did not say, This omit, or, This despise, but, This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, etc. Verily, He wants it done, and not entirely neglected and despised. This do ye, He says"

(<https://bookofconcord.org/small-catechism/preface/#sc-preface-0013>).

This has always been my conundrum in dealing with those who aren't regularly coming to the Divine Service and/or the Lord's Supper. I *can* tell who seeks the Lord's Supper; I *cannot* tell who desires it. A person could be desperately desiring both, but he is being told he is taking his life in his hands if he ventures into a place where he can't maintain his distance, people are projecting their voices, eating and drinking at one altar. Since, I can't tell, I have offered for years private Communion, and for months we had masked worship, no singing, and pastor-delivered Lord's Supper for all who wanted that in the Old Church. I was surprised how few did. This was as safe as I could make it.

Here's my second fear. Social Media is the authority. The "facts" are crowd-source. But any scientist will tell you the plural of 'anecdote' is not 'data', so just because 4 out of 5 say something doesn't make it true. It seems Covid has finally seen tech come into its own and I think it's in a place it doesn't belong. Here's what atheist Carl Sagan said, "A religion that stressed the magnificence of the universe as revealed by modern science, might be able to draw forth reserves of reverence and awe hardly tapped by conventional faiths. Sooner or later, such a religion will emerge." Here's what Social Media pundit Scott Galloway says, "Mr. Sagan's religion is here: it's Google" (*The Four: The Hidden DNA of Amazon, Apple, Facebook, 24*).

I've always said 3 things you'll never read on my website are: "Like us on Facebook", "Follow us on Twitter", and "Give to us on PayPal". I foolishly thought that was enough to stem the tide. I didn't realize it was a tsunami. I did realize around 2017 that I had no control of when and where, except for confirmands, people looked at their Smartphones. All I could do is preach the Word in season and out, when

Covid is hot and when it's not, when everyone feels safe gathering and few do. All I can do is keep on preaching, teaching, and celebrating regardless of Covid. The same would be true under persecution. I've no permission from God to use either as a reason for not preaching, warning, comforting, encouraging.

Elders' Meeting March 2, 2021 Notes

Fellowship Matters and Changes to the 2022 Conference Plans

We discussed the conference we have been planning for February 2022. Here, we have hit some snags. Pastor Harris has corresponded with several confessional pastors who would present papers, but it is difficult to get a commitment to our dates, because of COVID. Along with some other concerns, this led to a suggestion that we think might work better than the conference idea.

We are proposing replacing the 2022 conference with a speaker series. This could begin this year, and we would bring in one speaker at a time. We might have a lunch after church, followed by a talk/presentation, and we could do this regularly. Details are up for discussion, but this solves multiple issues: scheduling changes due to COVID are simpler, planning and logistics are much easier, and there is an opportunity to spread out the discussion over time, so we may have more success in identifying like-minded confessional congregations.

Texas Opening Up

We discussed what changes we might make once the statewide mask mandate is lifted on March 10. Currently, our plan is as follows:

- As of Sunday, March 14, we will remove the tape between pews and no longer wipe down the communion rail with vinegar. Our capacity will no longer be limited to 50%, so we will take down the signs about that. The Altar Guild will resume caring for the sacramental vessels.
- We will continue streaming our service to the old sanctuary at least through Easter.
- We will also continue praying the Litany through Easter, then go back to our regular prayers.

- We will continue streaming our service over Zoom and provide an MP3 copy on the website for the foreseeable future.

Derek Kurth

Vacation Catechetical School

July 26-29, 10:00 AM – 1:15 PM

As next Advent and Lent midweek services will be on the Third Chief Part of Luther's Small Catechism, so our summer's Vacation Catechetical School will be on it too. The theme will be "Breathe". Praying has often been likened to breathing in many ways. For example, the necessity of praying, danger in not praying, and it being natural if you're alive. Our 4-day curriculum will be as follows.

Monday: Introduction
"How to Breathe" Jesus Teaches to Pray

Tuesday: The 'Our' Petitions
"Breath of Heavenly Air" Jesus in Gethsemane

Wednesday: The 4th Petition
"Just Breath" Elijah is Fed

Thursday: The last 3 us Petitions
"Take a Deep Breath" Peter is Freed from Prison

We have volunteers to teach, do music, crafts, theater, and kitchen. We can you volunteer helpers in all areas. See Pastor Harris who will say, "See Angela Wetuski."

Excursus on Romans 13: 1-7 – How Not to Avoid What it Plainly Says While Still living in a World with Godless, Evil, Weak Authorities

(This was written by me long before Covid and government tyranny were in the news. At the time I presented it. I must say I thought the people were nonplussed by the presentation. I offer it again because, to me anyway, it is timely. PRH)

From Scripture: Government is portrayed often in Scripture not as a tamed, domesticated wild animal but as a beast. Both in Daniel and Revelation we see them portrayed more or less as ferocious but always powerful and dangerous. It is folly to forget a wild

animal, no matter how tamed it appears, is still a wild animal.

CONFESIONAL LUTHERANS GO TO THE CONFESSIONS TO HEAR WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT THE MATTER:

We start in the Table of Duties, IX, 5, “Duties Subjects Owe Governing Authorities.” This starts with Jesus’ words, “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s” thereby reminding us of a much-needed distinction that only Christians can, and must, make. We go on to quote Romans 13: 1, 5-7; 1 Timothy 2: 1,2; Titus 3:1; 1 Peter 2: 13,14.

Romans 13:1,5-7: “1 Let every person be in subjection to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God. ... 5 Wherefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake. 6 For because of this you also pay taxes, for rulers are servants of God, devoting themselves to this very thing. 7 Render to all what is due them: tax to whom tax is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.”

1 Timothy 2:1-2:” First of all, then, I urge that entreaties and prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, be made on behalf of all men, 2 for kings and all who are in authority, in order that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and dignity.”

Titus 3:1: “1Remind them to be subject to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good deed,”

1 Peter 2:13-14 : “3 Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether to a king as the one in authority, 14 or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and the praise of those who do right.”

Augsburg Confession, Article XVI: Of Civil Affairs. “1] Of Civil Affairs they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God, and that 2] it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the Imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers, to make legal contracts, to hold property, to make oath when required by the magistrates, to marry a wife, to be given in marriage. 3] They condemn the Anabaptists who forbid these civil offices to Christians. 4] They condemn also those who do not place evangelical perfection in the fear of God and in faith, but in forsaking civil offices,

for 5] the Gospel teaches an eternal righteousness of the heart. Meanwhile, it does not destroy the State or the family, but very much requires that they be preserved as ordinances of God, and that charity be practiced in such 6] ordinances. Therefore, Christians are necessarily bound to obey their own magistrates 7] and laws save only when commanded to sin; for then they ought to obey God rather than men. Acts 5:29.”

Apology, Article XVI: Of Political Order: 5] For the Gospel does not destroy the State or the family [buying, selling, and other civil regulations], but much rather approves them, and bids us obey them as a divine ordinance, not only on account of punishment, but also “on account of conscience” (Rom. 13:5). ...6] The Gospel does not introduce laws concerning the civil state but is the remission of sins and the beginning of a new life in the hearts of believers; besides, it not only approves outward governments, but subjects us to them, Rom. 13:1, just as we have been necessarily placed under the laws of seasons, the changes of winter and summer, as divine ordinances. 7]...He [Christ] would have them know their duty to teach that the spiritual kingdom does not change the civil government.

What Does Luther Say?

From Luther’s 1515-1516 Roman’s Lectures, i.e., pre-Reformation. References are from Kregel edition not Luther’s Works:

“In contradistinction to the Jewish conception, he teaches that Christians must subject themselves also to the wicked and the unbelievers” (179). (This thought is found in the Apology 15 years later.)

“Christians should not, under the pretense of Christian religion, refuse to obey men (in authority) even if they are wicked” (180).

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers (13:1). Is there (perhaps) a hidden meaning in the use of ‘every soul’ for ‘every person’? Perhaps he means to stress the thought that Christians must show a sincere subjection that comes from the heart. ...He thus shows that the believer once for all is exalted over all things, and yet at the same time subject to all things (PRH – This thought begins *Freedom of the Christian Man* which he will write in 1520.). As a dual being, he (the Christian) thus bears two forms in himself, just as did Christ” (180).

Luther quotes 13:1: the powers that be are ordained by God and cites a contemporary Catholic theologian,

Faber Stapulensis', view that of a two-fold government. One divinely instituted by God the other not. The implication being you're free to rebel against the latter. Only where there are governments of God are they ordained by Him, divinely instituted by Him. Luther rejects this "for there is no government that is not (divinely) instituted." Governments can be usurped and managed in ways not ordained by God. Just as other blessings of God are misused. "Money, for example, does not become evil through (the evil use) of theft. Hence, we must explain the words thus: Wherever there is governmental power, there it is instituted by God. That, wherever governments exist, they are ordained solely by God" (181).

Commenting on "Rules are not a terror to God works, but to the evil" Luther says, "They (the rulers) deter us not from good works, as though they should not be done, but from evil. That justifies governments and laudably commends them" (181).

Commenting on rulers being the minister of God to you for good he says, "Even if evil persons (rulers) do not desire to serve God, He directs all things in such a way that the good which they possess and they misuse – (their ordained governmental power) -must serve Him" (181-2).

He summarizes his thoughts on Romans 13: 1-7: "With reference to temporal government, however, the Apostle does not consider the question of (Christian) liberty; for this is not a (spiritual) servitude, but rather concerns all men" (184).

What Saith the Church Fathers About Romans 13: 1-7?

Origen: "Is an authority which persecutes the children of God, which attacks the faith, and which undermines our religion from God? We shall answer this briefly. Nobody will deny that our senses – sight, sound, and thought – are given to us by God. But although we get them from God, what we do with them is up to us. . . . God will judge us righteously for having abused what He gave us for good. Likewise, God's judgment against the authorities will be just, if they have used the powers they have received according to their own ungodliness and not according to the laws of God" (ACC, VI, 312).

Apollinaris of Laodicea [4th century]: He thinks Paul is reacting to a rebellion led by another that he knew of and Apollinaris says Paul is "condemning any attempt to imitate him based on the illusion that is a godly thing to disobey rulers" (Ibid., 312).

Chrysostom: "He does not speak about individual rulers but about the principle of authority itself. For that there should be rulers and ruled and that things should not just lapse into anarchy, with the people swaying like waves from one extreme to another, is the work of God's wisdom" (ACC, VI, 312-3).

Augustine: Since we're made of body and soul as long as we are in this life and make use of temporal things "it is fitting as far as this life is concerned, we be subject to the authorities. . . . But as far as the spiritual side is concerned, in which we believe in God and are called into his kingdom, it is not right for us to be subject to any man who seeks to overrun in us the very things which God has been pleased to grant us to that we might obtain eternal life." Augustine, has two poles. On the one hand, is the error that thinks because you're a Christian you don't have to submit, pay taxes, or honor. The other is accepting to the point of thinking someone his superior in temporal affairs should have authority over even his faith. The balance is in the Lord's: Render unto Caesar and God what is appropriate to each (Ibid., 313). [PRH – This citation comes from a work of Augustine's that I could not read in context. It's not in the Church Father's collection I have or available online.]

Theodoret of Cyr: "For it's not the wickedness of individual rulers which comes from God but the establishment of the ruling power itself. . . . Since God wants sinners to be punished, he is prepared to tolerate even bad rulers" (Ibid., 314).

Origen: "This injunction does not apply in the case of authorities who persecute the faith. It only applies to those who are going about their proper business" (Ibid., 314).

Augustine: He addresses the matter of doing good and yet suffering. "Were these Christians not doing good, since not only did the authorities not praise them, the punished and killed them!' The apostle's words must be carefully considered. He does not say: 'Do what is good and the authorities will praise you,' but: 'Do what is good and you will have praise from him.' Whether someone in authority approves what you do or persecutes you, 'You will have praise from him,' either when you win it by your obedience to God or when you earn your crown by persecution'" (Ibid., 315).

Pelagius: "The wicked should be afraid of the authorities, but the good have no reason to fear, for they come into glory if they are killed unjustly" (Ibid.).

Origen: He says they are God's servants in this way. "For God wants these crimes to be punished by human judges and not be representatives of the church" (Ibid.).

Pseudo-Constantius: In saying that a ruler is God's servant for good, "Paul shows that we must obey the authorities in those things which are right but not in things which are unlawful, or which go against the faith" (Ibid., 316).

What Can We Conclude? (From here to "Some Other Thoughts:" is taken from Middendorf, Romans 9-16, 1297-1315)

A slight exaggeration: "It is only a slight exaggeration to say that the history of the interpretation of Romans 13: 1-7 is the history of attempts to avoid what seems to be its plain meaning."

I like Middendorf's outline: General Command 13:1a

First reason (13: 1b)

Consequences (13:2)

Second Reason (13: 3-4)

Reiteration (13:5)

Appeal to practice (13:6)

Specific Command (13:7)

3 Implications that come from the general command: 1) Government is not something that evolved because man felt the need for it. It's God's doing. 2) All governing authority has a derived authority rather than an inherent one. 3) Paul clearly acknowledges the higher authority from whom the ordering comes. Ergo, Those who abuse their God-given authority or call for a greater submission that God has ordered will come under God's judgment.

Franzmann reproduces Paul use of ordained or ordered in 13:1,2, 5 in bad English this way: "Be subordinated...the authorities that exist have been ordained by God...He who refuses to subordinate himself...is resisting God's ordinance...Therefore one must subordinate oneself."

In accordance with how Paul uses the construction "not only...but also" elsewhere in Romans the minor reason for the Christian submitting is fear of punishment. The major is "because of conscience." And note in Romans 2:15 Paul doesn't think of the conscience operating distinctively in Christians.

Here's the standard way of redacting this text. It's from Leon Morris in his Romans commentary. Paul writes in general terms not legislating for every

situation. He doesn't face the problem when it's right to rebel against unjust tyranny; what to do when there are rival claimants to the crown, conflicts between civil and religious authorities; doesn't distinguish between legitimate and usurped authority; when a successful rebel may be held to be the legitimate ruler. He doesn't say what the Christian should do when the state fails its duty. He isn't trying to cover every situation.

Here's Middendorf's 7 options for dealing with Romans 13: 1-7

1) Paul doesn't demand such submission at all. Verse 1 and 5 say otherwise.

2) Paul is naïve about evil government; 1:18-2:11 say otherwise.

3) Paul is only demanding submission to government for what he thought would only be a short interval before the kingdom of God established peace. 13:11-14 speaking in light of eternity, the day, say otherwise.

4) Paul demands submission to authorities only as long as they manifest their own submission to Christ. Nero who was emperor Paul was going to be tried before wasn't submissive to Christ.

5) Paul is demanding submission to secular rulers only of the Roman Christians in their immediate situation. Nothing in the text limits it like this.

6) A government that doesn't punish evil and reward good forfeits the right to be submitted to as a servant of God. But how does one decide at what point a government has passed from God's servant to an enemy to be opposed? This attitude leans toward postmodern situational ethics.

7) There is a distinction between "being subject" something Paul does say and "obeying" something Paul does not say. There are 3 Greek verbs for 'obey' all of which are used in the NT and the word Paul does use doesn't mean 'obey.' Being subject therefore remains always imperative regardless of whether actual obedience presents a godly option in a given situation. Paul demands submission to government not strict and universal obedience. While being submissive to government, you could still disobey government in certain exceptional circumstances. However, this means you also willing submit to the punishment authority dole out in response.

Paul's approach is different from Sadducee, Zealot, Pharisee, and citizen. Sadducees lived from the advantages of the state authority. Zealots lived to overthrow the state.

Pharisees divorced religious obedience from obedience to the state. Roman citizens thought of the state as an end in itself.

Paul call's Christians to be not only submissive (13: 1,5) but also supportive (13:6-7).

Some other thoughts:

NT doesn't envision government. being responsible for social welfare. It doesn't prohibit them from doing so but the NT doesn't, as most moderns do, hold the government responsible for caring for the poor, sick, elderly, or educating the masses.

Paul lays out in I Timothy 2:1-4 the best explanation of how God's people live Romans 13: 1-7: " First of all, then, I urge that entreaties and prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, be made on behalf of all men, 2 for kings and all who are in authority, in order that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and dignity. 3 This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, 4 who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."

My Final Thought: We who live in Satan's little season which has witnessed the overthrow of every Christian monarchy and the brutality that accompanies the rule of godless materialism and scientism ought to be very circumspect about resisting the powers that be particularly at the instigation of someone else beating up our consciences.

Rev. Paul R. Harris
Trinity Lutheran Church, Austin, Texas
26 September 2018 A.D.

How do you recognize "radical Lutheranism"?

Rev. Mark Surburg
Good Shepherd Lutheran Church
Marion, IL
May 31, 2018
Surburg.blogspot.com

Todd Wilken, host of Issues, Etc., has shown great insight and skill in analyzing trends in the Church and culture. I appreciate his ability to break things down and clearly present the underlying beliefs and principles. He has done this with the trend present today that has often been called "radical Lutheranism."

The term is really a misnomer, because this trend does not confess the same theology as the Book of Concord. However, most who advance this theology

claim to be Lutheran and frequently appeal to Martin Luther. They use Lutheran theological language and emphasize themes that are very familiar to Lutherans.

Wilken has developed a list of points that describe the theology of radical Lutheranism and help to identify it. The more I work with this subject, the more I appreciate how insightful and accurate these points truly are:

The teachings of Radical Lutheranism can be recognized by any combination of the following ideas:

1. Sin is reduced to self-justification. The only thing intrinsically sinful about any thought, word or deed is that it is an attempt to justify oneself before God.
2. The Christian's struggle against sin is replaced with a struggle against feelings of guilt.
3. The Christian's struggle against sin is described as, at best futile, or merely an attempt at self-justification.
4. The Holy Spirit's uses of the Law are usually abandoned one by one (usually in the order of 3, 1, 2)
5. Contrition over sin is assumed, even in unbelievers. People are generally assumed to have a knowledge of, and guilty conscience over their sin.
6. The Law is confused with the pain and trouble of living in a fallen world. The Law may be described as any bad situation or evil occurrence in life.
7. The distinction between Justification and Sanctification is blurred in statements like "Sanctification is simply the art of getting used to justification."
8. Christian cooperation in Sanctification, clearly and carefully taught in the Lutheran Confessions, is equated with cooperation in Justification.
9. Christian cooperation in Sanctification is depicted as resisting, rather than cooperating with the Holy Spirit.
10. Encouragement or instruction in Good Works is considered de facto legalism.
11. The Law itself is viewed as the source of legalism, rather than man's sinful misuse of it.

12. Scripture's warnings against falling away from the faith are minimized or ignored.
13. Scripture is often searched to find the sinner, rather than the Savior.
14. The sins of Biblical figures are exaggerated or sensationalized.
15. Teaching is often guided by a reaction to the errors of moralistic evangelicalism, rather than God's Word or the Lutheran Confessions.
16. Man's sinful condition is described as though a person's sin qualifies him to receive Grace, rather than Grace being without qualification or condition in man.
17. The effects of the Law are attributed to the Gospel.
18. The Law may be avoided to such an extent that the Gospel is pressed into service to do the Law's work (produce repentance, instruction in good works through "Gospel imperatives").
19. The Gospel is sometimes replaced with "We're all sinners, who am I to judge?"

Justin Long-Lived

Posted on March 2, 2015 by [Rev. Paul R. Harris](#)

That wasn't his nom de guerre. Martyr was. There was a reason for that. He was an apologist not a satirist. About the same time Justin Martyr was making a defense for the Christian faith Juvenal was satirizing the Roman Empire. Justin was martyred for his apologetics; Juvenal might have been exiled, but he wasn't murdered. I watched a Lutheran satire on Mormons. It is spot on regarding the point of attack, but I still wish I hadn't watched it. Let me tell you why.

I'm not in favor of making points by satire for the same reason that I was not in favor of making Pro-Life arguments with gruesome pictures. I said at the time, 25 years ago, that the Pro-Abortions would respond with kinder gentler pictures, and they did. I think non-Lutherans are better at satirizing than Lutherans and unbelievers are best of all.

Many of our cherished Lutheran points can be satirized. So you believe in a Real Presence that you

admit has no physical manifestation? You believe that the Gospel cannot be accepted but that it can be rejected? You believe that salvation is solely by grace and that God is gracious to everyone but all are not saved? You believe the finite *is* capable of the infinite, that 25 pounds of flour can be stuffed in a 5 pound sack?

Picture a scene like the one in the Lutheran Satire video featuring the two grizzled Lutherans and the Mormon Missionaries. Have it be two Reformed pastors in Geneva gowns and two Lutheran pastors in albs. Have the dialect flow fast and furious between the two Reformed pastors with them directing yes and no questions to the Lutherans. Our position will be made to look at least funny and maybe ridiculous.

My second reason for not teaching by satirizing is that we train our people to think satire makes points, wins arguments, or advances truth. The end result is we train them to learn from it rather than simply be entertained by it. We train them to be more vulnerable to satire.

Just because you can laugh at something doesn't mean you have overcome it or won the day. The early Church had apologists and martyrs. They left the satirizing to the unbelievers. I say we leave it to *Saturday Night Live*, *Family Guy*, and *The Simpsons*. What is worth dying for is worth being *laughed* at; this you could learn from Justin Martyr. Not everything that can be laughed at is worth *dying* for. This you could learn from Juvenal and this is not what we want to teach.

You Only Think You Know the History of Pro-Life Politics

I've said, wrote, and documented over the years how slow the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod was at taking a vocal Pro-Life stance. This article will show you in part why: Pro-Life wasn't the direction the conservative winds were blowing (PRH).

Birth of a movement

A look back at the first two decades of pro-life work after Roe v. Wade
by [Marvin Olasky](#)

Post Date: January 14, 2021 - **Issue Date:** January 30, 2021

Connie Marshner was executive vice president of the Free Congress Foundation in the 1980s and chair of Ronald Reagan's Family Policy Advisory Board.

In 1972, if you were told one party would become the pro-life party and one party the party of abortion, which would you have selected? The Democrats would be pro-life. Lots of Republicans favored “population control.”

Abortion was a subset of population control? It wasn’t on the conservative radar. At the time the standard joke was, “Congressman, what do you want to do about this abortion bill?” “Oh, pay it.” When *Roe v. Wade* came along, nobody paid much attention to it except for those who were religiously oriented.

Were people following the *Roe v. Wade* oral arguments at the Supreme Court? Nobody on the right paid much attention to them.

What was the initial reaction to the *Roe* decision in January 1973? Nellie Gray, a liberal feminist civil rights activist who worked for the federal government, took it upon herself to visit senators with names like Kennedy. She assumed they would say, “We’ve got to fix this.” But her heroes were not interested.

She thought Ted Kennedy would see injustice? She assumed he and others would share her horror about people deprived of personhood. She couldn’t believe they wouldn’t talk with her.

So she organized in 1974 a March for Life. In those days that’s what you did if you had a civil rights issue: You organized a march. She contacted a couple of guys in New York, the Long Island equivalent of good old boys. They brought a couple of buses down, probably their American Legion buddies: blue-collar, Catholics, probably Irish. They came and they marched. It was very small.

Nellie found allies among conservatives? To her horror she discovered Republican conservative James Buckley wanted to introduce a human life amendment. She hadn’t talked to Republicans and had no use for them, certainly not conservative ones, but all of a sudden she found herself with a new set of friends.

Paul Weyrich, who co-founded the Heritage Foundation and the Free Congress Foundation, cemented the relationship? Paul would only support a candidate who agreed to support the Human Life Amendment. He did not want the pro-life issue to be a Republican-only issue. But in 1978 the Republican establishment said several elections were unwinnable—and Paul won them. For example, he had Roger Jepsen in Iowa go into the Democratic precincts with a pro-life flyer, and Jepsen won. The pro-life issue turned out Democratic voters to vote Republican.

They elected Ronald Reagan. But he didn’t deliver. Nancy Reagan was always pro-abortion. He would never do anything for the March for Life. Morton Blackwell at the time of the march in 1984 got him to meet with pro-lifers. This was considered a real accomplishment.

Did anything emerge from that? No, nothing was ever supposed to emerge from that. It was just window-dressing.

Two of the three Supreme Court justices who came out of the Reagan administration were disappointments. Sandra Day O’Connor made it because Reagan said he’d nominate a woman, but why that particular woman? A young staffer checked with a few people in Arizona. He didn’t talk with Carolyn Gerster, an Arizona doctor who was the Right to Life leader. By the time the pro-life people in Arizona made contact with us, it was too late. The Reagan folks wouldn’t withdraw her name.

How effective was the National Right to Life Committee? NRLC created an ungodly management structure: a board of 50, one member from every state. Getting all those people to make any decision was a nightmare. So in 1978 or 1979 NRLC hired Judie Brown, a Kmart internal auditor. She wanted to see pro-life candidates elected and took it upon herself to endorse them. The board says “we never authorized that, so goodbye”—and Judie founded the American Life League.

What started out as the Christian Action Council became Care Net, which grew a crisis pregnancy center network. A huge grassroots movement came in for Reagan because they thought he would be the pro-life savior. That didn’t happen. They dropped out of politics, but they didn’t drop out of the pro-life movement. They went back to their communities and set up CPCs. For years, when I would travel and meet people who knew my name because I had been visible, they’d say, “I used to do politics, but now I do this.”

Operation Rescue received a lot of attention in the late 1980s. OR was a PR disaster for the pro-life movement. We had made a lot of headway at the cultural person-to-person level on Main Street, but Operation Rescue, combined with shootings that were happening at the same time, gave the pro-life movement such a black eye that many people became afraid to be pro-life.

O R was playing off frustration. You could make a case that it was a safety valve, giving people a

creative outlet for their anger so they didn't do something more drastic.

But out of that low point some new strategies developed. The pro-life trajectory changed forever when people at our early-1990s pro-life leaders meetings said "Love them both"—the baby and the mom—would be our new thing. We hadn't been talking about the woman.

—*WORLD* has updated this Q&A to correct the description of Judie Brown's role at Kmart.

https://world.wng.org/2021/01/birth_of_a_movement

Three Little Words

Posted on February 22, 2021 by Rev. Paul R. Harris

I'm convinced. The criteria people use to evaluate candidates for the pastoral office are just moribund. They are not even so last century or the century before that. They aren't even so last millennia; they are the one before it. So, I think the following requirements, standards, qualifications are without merit in this enlightened 21st century of ours:

I don't think a pastor needs to be above reproach, sober-minded, or self-controlled. I don't think a Call committee should consider whether or not he is as Aretha sang (r-e-s-e-p-e-c-t ed), or hospitable, or able to teach. Let him be a drunkard, violent not gentle, even to the point of quarrelsomeness. And who decided a pastor can't be a lover of money? And talk about invasion of privacy! Who says the congregation gets to determine whether he manages his own house well? And submissive children? I suppose this means the congregation has got to require he keep his boys, boys and his girls, girls. Certainly, it's the height of arbitrariness to think he can't be a recent convert and must be well thought of by outsiders.

Of course, virtually no Christian disagrees with these criteria from 1 Timothy 3. All Christians agree: that they don't want drunks, rage-alcoholics, curmudgeons, and money-lovers for pastors. These aren't just Biblical standards; they "rise" to the level of received wisdom.

The only requirement Christians have felt free to disregard beginning in 1853 and culminating probably in 2013 is the "husband of one wife." And no, the latest New Testament text can't free us from the mud-boundness of our moribundity. Nestle-Aland 28 still says μιᾶς γυναῖκος ἄνδρα. That's literally "one wife male." And yes, this is the Greek word that emphasizes the 'maleness' part of manhood.

However, the modern and now postmodern world believes these three words fell from the pen of St. Paul without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This is Paul speaking out of his male chauvinism if not machismo. This is Paul speaking out of the narrowmindedness of his day, culture, education, or prejudices. O why resort to half measures? Just go with brazen unbelief: Paul never wrote this.

But the above only applies to those three little words. Unlike the 1930's song by that name, most modern Christians would rather **not** hear, read, let alone mark and inwardly digest, these three little words. But they want to keep the rest. They demand the rest from their clergy, even the female "clergy." They too are required to be sober, self-controlled, apt to teach, hospitable, and "not greedy of filthy lucre" [Isn't the KJV the best? You don't even have to know what lucre is but you sure don't want your pastor or pastorette greedy of it!]

So, what do those Calling, assigning, or ordaining the fairer sex do? Do they take out 1 Timothy 3 and go down it like a preflight checklist until those three little words? Check, check, check; O never mind, the Holy Spirit didn't really mean those three little words. They are timebound and therefore moribund to us. So, we are free to ignore them.

Ask Saul, Jezaniah (Jeremiah 42-43), or Jonah how ignoring words of God went with them. But hey; it's just three little Words.

Trinity Lutheran Church
1207 West 45th Street, Austin, TX 78756
512.453.3835

www.trinityaustin.com

Trinity Te Deum is published bi-monthly.

Deadline for all articles is the 15th of the odd months.

All articles must be approved by Rev. Paul R. Harris. Articles with no author are written by him.

APRIL 2021

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
				1 Maundy Thursday 7:30 PM	2 Good Friday 7:30 PM	3
4 EASTER	5 5 PM JR. CONFIRMATION	6	7	8	9	10
<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; background-color: #cccccc;"> PASTOR ON VACATION </div>						
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; background-color: #cccccc;"> PASTOR ON VACATION </div>						
18	19	20	21 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY RESUMES 7:15 PM	22	23 WEDDING REHEARSAL	24 WEDDING
<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; background-color: #cccccc;"> PASTOR ON VACATION </div>						
25 12:15 PM ADULT CLASS	26 5 PM JR. CONFIRMATION	27	28 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY 7:15 PM	29	30	

MAY 2021

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
						1
2 VCS PLANNING MEETING	3 JR. CONFIRMATION 5 PM	4 ELDERS MEETING 6:30 PM	5 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY 7:15 PM	6	7	8
9	10	11	12 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY 7:15 PM	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; background-color: #cccccc;"> COUPLES TRIP TO THE COAST </div>						
23 PENTECOST DINNER	24	25	26 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY 7:15 PM	27	28	29
30	31	1	2 DANIEL BIBLE STUDY 7:15 PM	3	4	5