

Infiltration of Evangelicalism, III

We are dealing with some areas where Schaeffer saw a drift within evangelicalism toward what he called existential methodology, or accommodation with that. We have looked at several different points—eight points, to be precise, on this. Our last point was the development of a dialectical view of truth.

We will move on now to point number nine just very briefly. I call this the drift toward universalism. In *The Church Before the Watching World*, Schaeffer talks about that within liberalism. As this whole view affects evangelicalism, whether it is uncertainty about truth or an uncertainty about sure knowledge of what Scripture says, you begin to find within evangelicalism itself less of a confidence that Christianity is the only true religion. You also find the creeping in of ideas that suggest that possibly God uses elements of other religions to bring people to faith and that an explicit response to Christ is not necessary for salvation, etc. I do not want to give any specific examples of that, but I think if you look around that you will find them within the evangelical community. There is not such a strong emphasis on the radical uniqueness of the Christian message. You see, if you begin to devalue propositional truth, if you begin to devalue the absolute certainty of biblical inerrancy and the certainty of biblical knowledge, and you begin to stress the heart over against reason, the inevitable consequence of that is to say that what you formally believe is less important. It is rather the sincerity of the heart, the response of the heart to what information it has that then begins to become the basis of salvation rather than a response to certain knowledge.

I remember reading an essay by Charles Kraft on communicating to a Muslim where he downplays the importance of speaking about the divinity of Christ, the uniqueness of Christ, and substitutionary atonement. This is because those ideas are offensive to Muslims. What one is trying to do is to shape the message toward the hearer, but not just in the sense of the way it is framed or the language that is used, but even the content of the message itself. Now, once you start doing that and you begin to lose some of the central elements of the biblical message, faith is being defined as a response to what information is already there from God's revelation of Himself in creation or to even the religious knowledge the individual already has. And what becomes saving is the quality of the faith itself rather than the object of that faith, who is Christ. I would suggest that this is something that we will see as an increasing problem within the evangelical community. I am no prophet, but that is an area where I would say we will see more and more of a drift in that direction. Setting faith and reason apart, or the heart and the mind apart, inevitably takes you in that kind of direction. It downplays the importance of the knowledge someone has, of the object of their faith, and puts the stress much more on what is in the heart and on the nature of their faith.

Let me move on to the next issue. This next issue is much easier to see. It is what I would call a slipping morality. This will be point number ten: a slipping morality. Schaeffer speaks about this quite a bit in *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. He speaks about this with regard to the change in the view on divorce and remarriage. He says,

Now certain moral absolutes in the area of personal relationships given in the Bible are said to be culturally oriented. I will mention two examples. The first is easy divorce and remarriage. [...] Some evangelicals are now putting the biblical teaching in that area under the bracket of cultural orientation. Thus what we find in the New Testament is a cultural orientation to a particular view of Judaism rather than permanent or absolute or sure statements on the basis for divorce and remarriage among Christians. [...] We find the same thing happening in the area of the clear

biblical teaching regarding order in the home and the church. [He is talking about the biblical teaching that there is a structure in marriage, a headship given to the husband, and in the church as well with the calling for pastors to be men]. In both of these areas, basically what is being said is that the New Testament statements are culturally oriented. Now, we could think of many examples like this within the evangelical community today.

The point Schaeffer goes on to make is this: what actually becomes our authority if we do this? If we start saying the moral teaching of the New Testament is culturally oriented, the question then arises, what is our authority? What is the Christian's authority, the church's authority in the area of morality? And Schaeffer makes this point, "Our authority becomes our ever shifting, fallen culture." Thus in actual fact for those who question the Bible's teaching on, let us say, the structure in marriage, or on the grounds for a divorce, the authority is actually where our culture is today. It is no surprise that those who question those things end up with precisely the same view that is taught by the culture today. That has actually become their authority. Schaeffer says that is an ever shifting authority, and it is also fallen. There is no permanence in our culture in terms of what its moral values are. It is always changing. In addition, it is made up of sinful men and women. It is a fallen culture. Yet that is being placed as the authority.

You can read, for example, perhaps one of the most famous and influential books in this area, Paul Jewett's book, *Man as Male and Female*. In this book the author quite clearly states his views on the apostle Paul's teachings on men and women. He calls them "a vision of misery." It is impossible, he says, to have an equality of persons and yet any kind of hierarchy or structure in marriage or in the church. And he simply says, "Paul was shaped by his Phariseical culture," whereas we, under the direction of the Spirit, know better today. Although there is an attempt to appeal to the analogy of the faith (that is his argument), what is really being said is that our culture has declared that this is impossible. Those are not the words he uses, but that is really where people are coming at. Our culture has declared that equality and headship are impossible to have together.

I can think of another example. My friend when he was here this last semester told me that at the evangelical college where he teaches, one of the members of the faculty had contributed an article to a volume on the male/female issue. And this faculty member had written an article in which they said that all the canonical books written by women in the first century had been suppressed by chauvinists like the apostle Paul and other chauvinists in the early church. And that is why the New Testament books were all written by men. All the authoritative, biblical books written by women were suppressed by a chauvinistic early church, and that is why there are no books written by women in the New Testament. Now, historically, that is nonsense. What is extraordinary about it, though, is not just the argument itself, for which there is not one shred of evidence historically. But what is extraordinary is that the person writing such an article is teaching at an evangelical college. That is an indication of what I have called here a slipping morality.

Another area would be the area of homosexuality. Those who wish to defend homosexuality from an evangelical perspective jumped on the arguments of Paul Jewett in *Man as Male and Female*. They said this was true of the apostle Paul's views on homosexuality as well, that his views were purely cultural as well. And the Christian today has come to recognize, so the argument goes, that homosexuality is also a valid option for the believer. You find more and more expressions of this. There have been several quite dramatic ones of this in Saint Louis in the past year or so, of people who have been evangelical pastors and leaders. Some have been coming out, leaving their wives, and saying, "It is perfectly all right for an evangelical Christian to be a homosexual." But there are many, many areas in which this will take place.

If you start saying that the moral teaching of the New Testament is simply cultural, your only authority then becomes the culture in which you live at the present moment.

The other way of, if you like, of changing the morality or slipping from the biblical morality is the kind of direction that has been taken by some of the missiologists, who say that the New Testament only teaches us very broad principles. They treat Paul's requirement for an elder or pastor to be the husband of one wife, or in other words, for him to be monogamous. One missiologist puts it this way, "The only real principle involved in Paul's requirement is that the elder be respected in their community." Thus if we are living in a monogamous society, the elder has to be a husband of one wife. If we are living in a polygamous society, then the elder should be respected for his perhaps four or five wives." But the actual, moral teaching of Scripture becomes cultural itself, and behind are just very, very broad principles that have no particular moral content. That would be another whole area of slipping morality. Again, if you look at James Davidson Hunter's book, *Evangelicals: The Coming Generation*, it is particularly worrying to read. He went around with his research assistants doing research at evangelical colleges and seminaries. There is clearly a quite dramatic drift among younger evangelicals.

The question has been asked, do we sometimes confuse biblical morality with what has become the norm in Western culture? And how do we learn to distinguish between what is truly biblical and what is just tradition in the West? I think we are always asked by Scripture to sit in judgment over our own culture. The Bible is not negative about human culture; it is part of God's gift to the human race. It is part of being human that we have culture. But we are always asked by Scripture to sit in judgment over human culture. You can think of Paul's words in Romans 12:1 and 2, that we are not to be conformed to this world—by which he means the culture around us—which is always fallen, because it is inhabited by sinful human beings. We are not to be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewing of our minds.

Now, it is very important that we subject our culture to Scripture in two kinds of ways. The first would be the sort of area about which I have been speaking. Our culture, or some strong elements in our culture, says that homosexuality is natural and right. What does the Scripture teach? Then we look at Scripture, and it teaches quite clearly that homosexuality, homosexual practice, is a sin. Therefore we must see homosexuality as a falling away from God's original creation pattern.

Now, whether an individual has a homosexual inclination or not is not really the question biblically. In fact, it has not even been demonstrated that that is the reality. It is a huge argument, even at the present time, among psychologists—whether people are by nature homosexual or whether it is a product of both choice and environment. At the moment the strongest evidence seems to be on the side of particular environmental pressures, that they can produce homosexual inclinations in an individual. And they can, in fact, shape the whole direction of that person's personality. One does not want to say this is simply a matter of choice, nor is it simply something superficial. But clearly for some people, a homosexual orientation becomes very fundamental to who they see themselves to be and perhaps to who they really are.

But even if it were demonstrated that some people are born with a homosexual orientation, that would not make it right. This is because all of us are born as broken persons. That is what the biblical view of the Fall means. Every one of us comes into this world with a distorted personality—not only with an inclination to sin, but with a distorted personality. Thus one person may be born, let us say, physically blind. Another person may be born with epilepsy. Another person may be born with a tendency toward an extremely bad temper. Another person may be born with schizophrenia. Another person may be born with a tendency for manic depression. I do not doubt that is a reality. In fact, it is clear that all of us are

damaged by the Fall. And another person may be born with a disoriented sexuality. The fact that that is so does not make it right. We have to be prepared to say, "It is not nature that makes us who we are and who we are to be, because our nature is fallen. It is God's Word, and we have to trust what He says. This is who He has created us to be."

That is one example where what the culture says must be subjected to biblical criticism. But we also have to do something else. We also have to ask the question is traditional Western morality fully biblical, or is it in fact cultural?

Let me give you an illustration. If you look at the views of the relationship between men and women in America today among conservative evangelicals, much of the view of marriage and roles within marriage is shaped by the last 100 years of Western culture, from the middle of the nineteenth century up to this present time. So if you ask many evangelicals what their model of marriage is, their biblical model of marriage, they will reply, "A biblical model of marriage is one where the wife stays home at home and cares for the children and the husband is out in the workplace." And there is a radical division of roles in their understanding. And they would also see the biblical model as basically being a nuclear family, in which there is a father and mother and two or three children.

Now, we have to recognize that this particular model of the family is one that only developed in modern, Western society in the middle of the nineteenth century after the Industrial Revolution. It has since existed up to the very recent past and into the present for many people. In most traditional societies in other parts of the world and in our own society here in the past and in the society we see in Scripture, that is not the model. First of all, you have extended family where there are often grandparents, large families, and other relatives and people in the home. One enormous difference that makes is the mother is not the only person caring for the children. She has other people helping her. And we must not legislate from the present situation to say, "This is what is right" or "This is what is biblical." You had more people involved in the care of children than there is in many modern families.

The second thing that is different is that in the traditional family in any agrarian society, both mother and father were equally involved in providing for the family. They both worked on the family farm, or sawmill, or whatever it was. Both were involved in meeting the needs of the family in terms of providing financially, providing food and clothing and such for the family. If you read Proverbs 31, that is what you have there in the picture of a good wife. She is involved in buying and selling, in farming, and in all kinds of things in the community. Her life is not in the home in the way that many evangelicals think every wife's life should be today because we have legislated from our culture. Thus that is a second thing you can say. Both husband and wife in many traditional cultures have been involved in providing for the family. That is true even if you go back to hunter and gatherer societies, where the husband hunted and the women gathered. Even where there was not agriculture, both were involved in provision.

A third difference in most traditional societies and in the biblical society is that the husband and wife were both involved in caring for and raising the children, whereas in Western culture today, the whole way our economy is structured virtually requires most husbands to be out of the home from seven in the morning until seven at night. They almost never see their children while the children are small. But we must not legislate from that and say that is the biblical norm. That is clearly not the picture you have in Scripture. The picture you have in Scripture is the constant appeal that God is like a father who cares for His little children. Now, certainly there are things a mother does for a little child that a father cannot do, and of course Scripture itself makes that clear. But we must not legislate from our present experience of

what family life has become like and say, “This is the biblical pattern” or “This is the biblical teaching” or “These are the biblical role models.” Sadly that is often what is done.

I think another element we have there where something that has been true in modern, Western culture, as well as in most other societies and has been taught as biblical is that headship was seen in the past in our culture and in many other cultures around the world to mean domination. And submission has been seen as subordination and inferiority. That is clearly not biblical, either in the Old or the New Testament. We have to make sure that our understanding of marriage is not determined by our society. We must hold to the structure of marriage that the Bible gives, that there is a headship given to the husband in marriage. But that headship must not be seen as domination; it must not be seen as superiority, it must not be seen as simply giving orders or making all the decisions in the way that it is sometimes taught in evangelical seminars and books. That is not what the New Testament says at all.

This question is a very good one. We have to very carefully distinguish between the traditions of our culture and what the biblical pattern is. And we should always seek to move in the direction of the biblical pattern rather than simply being shaped by the culture in which we live. And conservative evangelicals, particularly on this kind of issue, are very prone not to subject their thinking deeply enough to what Scripture says. Rather, we often simply legislate from the pattern of the recent past and say, “This is what it should be.”

This is the same in other societies. Of course, some societies are far more authoritarian in marriage than Western society is. And one can read Peter’s statements about headship and put them through that grid of authoritarianism and just completely forget what he says about how the husband is to respect his wife because they are joint heirs of the grace of life. And if he does not, his prayers will be hindered. Now, there are all kinds of things in the New Testament that really challenge the whole idea of male superiority. In Christ there is neither male nor female. There is an equality of persons, an equality of spirituality, an equality of gifts, and an equality in the fact that all of us are heirs of Christ, all of us our priests. There is no male priesthood in the New Testament; every believer is a priest, male and female. That would be an area where one has to say one sympathizes with some of the reactions of evangelical feminism, because they are reacting quite properly to something they ought to react to. Traditional models have been pushed over biblical teaching and equated with biblical teaching. Now, often they are reacting too far and are not content to say, “This traditional model is not the biblical one.” Rather, they continue on to say, “And we do not like the biblical model either and want to get rid of it.” There is really a challenge to us, I would say, to really walk a tightrope and on the one hand to not be content with saying, “Our tradition is what the Bible teaches,” but on the other hand when we see that problem not to then say, “Let us see what our culture is saying on this point” and also reject what the Bible teaches. What we are called to is a radical submission to the Word of God.

It has been asked whether this slipping morality often is not just a shaping by the culture but a reaction to what is claimed to be biblical morality. Yes, I think that is true in several ways. The first is, and this is a tremendous problem in fundamentalism in particular, often people are not content with the commandments God has given us in His Word. This has been a problem throughout church history. You see it in the New Testament with the Pharisees. They want to add to God’s commandments 10,000 other commandments to make it absolutely clear what everyone has to do in every circumstance that will ever face them. Instead of being content with the principles God has given and the clear commandments, many of which could be expressed in 1000 diverse ways in real obedience, the Pharisees made rules for every circumstance you could ever face. They were asking, “What do I do when I am faced with this?” rather than saying, “We seek God’s wisdom by the power of His Spirit to know how the commandment is to be applied now, in my life, in this moment.” Thus they came up with all these rules.

Now, that has happened over and over again in the history of the church. And in the twentieth century, there is a huge burden of evangelical legalism in Western Christianity. This even surfaced itself at the seminary here, when I was a student 20 years ago. I and a few other students came from non-Christian backgrounds, had gone to secular universities, and were certainly, I suppose, influenced by the cultural moment in which we lived in terms of outward forms. We had long hair, mustaches, and beards. We wore sandals and would not wear ties, and we questioned everything that everyone on the faculty taught. That is what we had been told education was at university.

At the same time, when I came here as a student in 1967 or 1968, there was a group of students from very fundamentalist Bible colleges. I had never met people like them before, and they had never seen people like me. A group of 20 of them actually drew up a petition, asking the faculty to require us to cut our hair, shave our beards and mustaches, wear shoes and ties, and stop asking questions. The faculty, to their great credit, ignored this petition completely. It was more a cultural clash than anything, but there was also a clear element of legalism in it. There is a good end to the story. We all became very good friends by the end of our three or four years here, and I think it was a good thing for both groups. There was a cultural clash there that needed to be resolved. We had to learn to get along with each other as people from such diverse backgrounds. And we did. We all became very good friends. But there was clearly an element of legalism there, an idea of “this is what it means to be an evangelical Christian. You have to wear these kinds of clothes, you have to have this kind of a haircut. You must never drink, dance, or go to movies, or do anything that is considered worldly.” And we were dreadfully worldly as far as they could see! Well, my response would be, and it was, “I am not doing anything Scripture commands me not to do. I have a desire to live in submission to God. But I do not think it is necessary for me to follow these little rules you have made up. Where are they in Scripture? Show me.” And of course they could not show me.

It was really rather funny, because at the time crew cuts for hair were very popular among American evangelicals. And people tried to argue from 1 Corinthians 11 that really the spiritual haircut was a crew cut. Now, this was so obviously absurd; it was so obviously a cultural pattern being imposed on Scripture that it hardly deserved an answer. Now, that is one way in which what appears to be Christian morality can become very unpopular because people do not see the kind of righteousness that Scripture desires, rather, they see a huge burden of rules that no one can keep.

Paul is really very strong about this, and Jesus is as well. He says in Matthew 23:23, “You have neglected the more important matters of the Law—justice, mercy and faithfulness,” and done all these other little things instead and thought you were righteous. And Paul says in Colossians 2 with very powerful words, “Such regulations indeed have an appearance of wisdom, with their self-imposed worship, their false humility and their harsh treatment of the body, but they lack any value in restraining sensual indulgence.” Legalism always appears wise. You think, “Here are my kids, here are the young people in our church, here are the new Christians; we will create 1000 rules that will describe for them and define for them what spirituality is. They will know how much of the Bible they need to read every day, how long they need to pray, which habits are spiritual and which are not spiritual.” These are all kinds of things that are not mentioned in Scripture. That is not to say that we should not read the Bible—of course we should. But that is not the issue here. The issue is that we are telling people the form in which they have to do this. We may think, “These rules will be helpful while they are young believers.” But Paul says they lack any value in restraining the sinful nature.

One of the saddest things to me, and this is a really sad comment, is that several of my fellow students here who were the most legalistic are men who have since committed adultery in the pastorate. This is a dramatic illustration of the way rules, legalism, added to Scripture does not help you in dealing with sin.

It really does not help you. That is the one reason a “biblical” morality can earn a bad name. Of course, this is not really a biblical morality at all. You can think of Jesus’ condemnation of the Pharisees, which is so strong. “You scour land and sea to make a convert. You are hypocrites and you make other people into hypocrites.” Out of all these things, His strongest denunciations are for the legalists.

I think the other thing that can bring discredit on biblical morality is what Paul calls a form of godliness without its power. This is where you can have an appearance of righteousness and a kind of self-righteousness by simply observing the commandments. “I do not commit adultery, I do not steal, I do not do this or that.” These really are biblical commandments. But that obedience is held with pride, sinners are looked down on, and there is no compassion. What is missed here is the command to love people. You never see anyone more righteous than Jesus. He did not disobey any commandment. Yet He loved sinners, whereas the Pharisee would stand there and say, “Thank you, God, that I am not like other men.”

Now, that kind of self-righteous obedience to biblical commandments, or at least to some biblical commandments, not all of them, again earns Christianity a very bad name. This happens because it is seen as a kind of “holier-than-thou” attitude. This kind of “righteousness” is used as an excuse to look down on sinful people. And Jesus never did that. When He was around prostitutes and tax collectors, who were really the despised sinners of His day, they never felt rejected or despised by Him. This is a tremendous challenge to us as Christians. Yet we must commit ourselves to full obedience to biblical commandments, to a righteousness that surpasses the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. At the same time, if we really understood the law of God, the heart of the law of God is loving the Lord your God and loving your neighbor as yourself. And if you love your neighbor as yourself, it means loving the sinner, too. Anyone who really loves God knows that he himself is a sinner, completely dependent on the mercy of God, and I have no business ever looking down on someone else as a sinner. Rather, my response should be compassion for them and sorrow for them.

I think, for example, of these fellow students of mine who have committed adultery. On the one hand, I have to say, “Legalism does not help.” But on the other hand, I do not say that with any kind of joy, but rather with a tremendous amount of sorrow. Here are people who have wrecked their lives and who have wrecked their ministries. And that is an appalling tragedy to them and to their families. I think of their wives and children. This is a tragedy for the churches where they were pastors because of the tremendous distress this brought on the congregations. And this is a tragedy for the honor of the Gospel itself. Thankfully, the particular men I am speaking about are being delivered from their sin, and I think they have become much wiser men in the process in terms of really understanding what righteousness is.

But those are two ways in which we can bring discredit on biblical morality. We have to say that it is not true biblical morality at all. Both of them are forms of Phariseeical morality, the one is legalism, and the other is self-righteousness. And neither of them is what the Scripture speaks about. But that second form especially is a very easy refuge for the Christian who is frightened by the immorality of the cultural. He can retreat into the situation where we surround ourselves with people who obey the commandments of God. And we just drive out any compassion for those who do not, saying, “We should never be friends with them. We do not want anything to do with them.” And that really does bring the people of God and the Gospel a very bad name. The world is full of sinful people but also hurting people who need someone to extend a hand to them rather than condemn them.

We can take the example of Daniel in the Old Testament who, we are told, prayed three times a day. He had his set times to pray where he really disciplined himself to do that. Often, then, this is used as a challenge to a congregation to say, “This is what you should do, too,” in one form or another. Now, I

think what we have to say here is this. Self discipline is very important, whether it is in regard to prayer, reading Scripture, or any other aspect of our lives. All of us are lazy people. All of us give in very easily to the pressures of the moment, to feeling tired, having too much to do, or whatever else. And particularly when we are living in a secular society where God is completely squeezed out of the life of our culture, it is very easy for the Christian, as Schaeffer says, to sit in the materialist's chair. The image he uses is of a room with no windows. And here we are; we sit on our little chair in this room with no windows at all. That is the materialist's world. And we can live like that all the time. Now, in actual fact, of course, we live in a world with windows, enormous windows—in fact, there is not even a roof on it. This is because God acts into this world all of the time. That is what we believe. And it is a tremendous challenge to us; I think it is one of the most difficult challenges we face as Christians living in this generation and in this culture, to really believe and act on the conviction that this is a world into which God acts rather than a world that is closed to God. Of course we all believe in God, but do we believe in Him in practice day by day?

Now, as we think of that challenge, there are two responses we need to make. One is we need to have a gradually growing conviction that this is really true. I am not making things up when I say that God acts into the world. That is really the truth. The secular view, the view that life is just this moment between life and death, there is nothing afterward and nothing before, I have not come from anywhere and I am not going anywhere, is a lie. And the most important response to this is growing in my conviction of what is true. I really recommend to you Schaeffer's tapes on prayer, especially his framework for prayer where he talks about this issue. But our other response has to be that self-discipline is important in terms of saying, "I will set aside time to read and meditate on the Word of God and to pray," because otherwise our lives in this society are so busy that we will not do that. I mean, England is busy, but when I came to live in America, life proceeds so rapidly that there is no time for anything. Everybody is so busy all the time. And unless you really are self-disciplined and say, "I will take time to pray, I will set time aside to pray," in addition to praying without ceasing, which is what the New Testament commands us to do, it will get squeezed out.

Now, that is important, to challenge people to self-discipline. But it is also important not to set patterns for others. The Scripture nowhere says to us, "We must pray this many times a day. You must pray for half an hour today. You must read so many chapters of the Bible a day," or whatever else it happens to be. What we are commanded is to read the Word of God and to grow in our understanding of it and to pray. And we should see that as a privilege rather than simply as a matter of obedience, that we have the opportunity to bring our lives, needs, troubles, and sorrows before God. That is a privilege, not a duty. Thus self-discipline is important, but you have to let people work out their own patterns. You see, the Scripture never sets a pattern for our lives. It gives us the general commands, but then it lets the individual work out before the Lord what that pattern will be.

Now, certainly it is good to preach on people like Daniel or on Jesus staying up all night preaching. But when we do that, our response must be, "This is a wonderful example that should inspire us. Here is an individual who really took praying seriously at great cost to himself. Are we taking prayer seriously in our lives?" And then let the people work out the pattern for themselves as to what it will be. Otherwise what we do is create legalism. I have met people who have come from very legalistic families and churches who have found prayer terribly difficult and who literally hated reading the Bible. I mean that seriously. This was because it was such a rigid requirement in their family. They were made to feel so guilty if they had not read so many chapters a day or if they had not spent their half an hour of prayer time, or whatever it was. It began to be a legalistic work for them. "If I do not do this, God will hate me. I cannot be a real Christian." And there is a kind of bondage in that, which is very unhealthy. We have been set free by Christ from any kind of rules or bondage like that. What we need to try to encourage is

such a delight in the truth of the Gospel and such a delight in God Himself that people will want to pray and want to read His Word. That is what you are really trying to do. Our task as teachers and preachers in the church is to teach, encourage, and inspire people so that this is what they desire to do. We do not want to make them go away feeling like, “If I do not do this, I should feel really guilty,” because then we are doing what the Pharisees did—putting burdens on people that they should not have to bear. And we really have to avoid that, no matter what an appearance of wisdom it may have. That is a fine line to walk.