

# Human Nature

(Part II)

PAUL F. ABEL

## V. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN DEPRAVITY OR THE DEMERIT OF SIN AND HUMAN NATURE

There is a necessary distinction to be made between human nature and depravity. The essential constituents of human nature within each individual are neither moral nor immoral; they are morally neutral. Depravity merely means that human nature has been conditioned by the withdrawal of divine fellowship. It represents the negation of the originally intended organization of human nature. This negative aspect then gives rise to concrete forms of evil through personal sin. No one is held either guilty or accountable for the demerit which resulted from original sin. The peril of sin, therefore, lies in personal sin and personal self-assertion which commandeers the morally neutral human nature into non-conformity to God's law through an act of intentional violation.<sup>52</sup>

Depravity is used adjectively to describe the particular *state* in which human nature may be, but it does not refer to the human nature itself. The essential human nature—the physical, mental, and spiritual traits of man—makes a person essentially human in distinction from all other forms of creation. Regardless of whether or not the individual is affected by the demerit of sin, these traits are manifest and must be operative as long as man is truly a human being.

Again, depravity does not necessarily mean that man's nature is foul or corrupted; rather, it means "that everything in human life is affected by the fundamental wrong relationship to God which lies at the very root of man's being."<sup>53</sup> In

a word, it is the demerit which resulted from Adam's Primal Sin, by which human nature lost its organizing principle or fellowship with God. It is the *condition* of the essential human traits which inevitably gives direction toward evil, but is not the traits themselves. Thus, depravity is not in itself a defect in the primal elements of human nature; it is a defect in the organization of human nature.

As has already been stated, human nature is neither moral nor immoral; it is *neutral or amoral*. Human nature is not merely morally neutral in the abstract, but it is existentially and empirically so even though it may be under the domination of evil. As far as his distinctively human traits are concerned, therefore, each person is born with a nature which is just as capable of being directed toward the good as it is toward the evil. This is but to say that human nature is the same whether in the saint or in the sinner—each is distinctively human. The former's human nature is properly organized in accordance with the laws of his constitution, in fellowship with God. The sinner, on the other hand, is disorganized because he attempts to organize himself about a false center—his *ego*.

When man becomes a sinner he does not lose his humanity. In fact, the distinctively human characteristic, self-transcendence, alone makes it possible for man to live in opposition to his constitution. Man's faculties are not impaired by sin, in fact they participate in sin and are carried along by it. "They suffer the fundamental distortion of an alien will."<sup>54</sup> But they equally participate in the life of the saint who enjoys the fundamental harmony of a reconciled will. *In a word, the same propensities are resident within hu-*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 206f.

<sup>53</sup> Farmer, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

<sup>54</sup> Hopper, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

*man nature when it is conditioned toward sin as when it was originally conditioned toward righteousness prior to the withdrawal of divine fellowship.*

How does this view account for universal sinning? If human nature is neutral and fully capable of direction toward both good and evil, why is it that natural man since the time of Adam has never been able to direct it toward the good? Why has he always become a sinner? There is an element of truth in Niebuhr's contention, as interpreted by Rees, that to be finite is not a sin, but to be finite is to be a sinner.<sup>56</sup> This suggestion is significant only if its relevancy applies to man after the fall and the Primal Sin of Adam, whereby the relationship of the race to God was reversed from that which was originally intended. Man, dependent and finite, is born into this world with an amoral or neutral human nature, and is intrinsically capable of development in the direction of either goodness or evil. But man, because of his position under God as a member of an estranged or alienated race—*not because of an evil human nature*—finds it impossible to live as he was created to live, and he becomes anxious (to borrow another concept from Niebuhr), or he becomes morally fearful (to borrow a concept from Curtis).<sup>56</sup>

Man's life was not made to be lived in suspension. A state of anxiety cannot long remain without producing some effort to relieve the tension. Hence man soon seeks to replace his dependence by a spirit of independence. A distinctive part of human nature is man's religious inclination. He is so constituted that he must have gods to whom he renders homage. " ' Man always had God or an idol.' He can no more rid himself of this dimension of his existence than he can rid himself of the dimension of time . . . ." <sup>57</sup> Some center of loyalty must replace the void left by his estrangement from God, and the logical, most immediate loyalty is to himself. In this re-

spect, Niebuhr makes the valid observation that evil in the human situation arises because man does not acknowledge his finiteness and dependence, and commits the personal sin of grasping after power and security which are beyond the possibility of achievement. Note that this is one of the salient points in the doctrine of the *kenosis* of Christ as presented by Paul:

Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient . . . <sup>58</sup>

Hence, to grasp after illegitimate power constitutes an act of personal sin for which the individual is accounted responsible and culpable. In this manner, the *amoral* human nature is bent under the domination of evil or actual sin.

There is a sense, therefore, in which the finality of the Fall consists in the fact that every person renews the Fall afresh. He is inextricably caught in the human process of falling, nor can he get back to his origin. His own efforts to do so lead only to further involvement in sin and egocentricity.<sup>59</sup> If it is granted that there was a historical fall and an original sin by Adam which produced the demerit that is responsible for man's position under God as an alien, there is a further truth in the fact that "original sin" is a part of present human experience. There is a sense in which men who have been created for fellowship with God are continually repudiating their dependence upon that fellowship.<sup>60</sup> Thus individual man re-enacts the "fall" and involves himself in "original sin" in the sense that he originates his own culpability for personal sin.

This view does not warrant the statement, however, that "Everyman is his own 'Adam' . . . ." <sup>61</sup> This would imply that

<sup>56</sup> *The Holy Bible* (Standard edition, newly edited by the American Revision Committee, A.D. 1901, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901), Philippians 2:5-8.

<sup>59</sup> Brunner, *op. cit.*, pp. 171ff.

<sup>60</sup> Whale, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

<sup>61</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>56</sup> Rees, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>56</sup> Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 250; Curtis *op. cit.*, pp. 210f.

<sup>57</sup> Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

Adam's sin was inevitable. But he was originated in a relationship of positive communion with God; his nature was properly organized under this fellowship. Hence he had every reason to keep from sinning. Mankind since his fall, however, has not been in a similar situation. Men are born into a race whose relationship to God is negative. Man's life is unorganized through the loss of its proper center, and man inevitably brings his human nature under the domination of evil through personal sin. Thus, the situation of Adam and his posterity is worlds apart. This was the fundamental error of Pelagius and all true Pelagians through the centuries.

It might be concluded, therefore, that the view expressed in this section does not deny the universality of sinning, rather it insists that such is inevitable. It does, however, deny that this sinning is due to the intrinsic sinfulness of human nature; it is said to be due to the *universal position* of all men under God as alien. Hence, it is a truism to say that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,"<sup>62</sup> but this does not mean that man is born a sinner; it only means that he inevitably becomes a sinner. Note the Psalmist's analysis in this regard: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies."<sup>63</sup> No clearer support of the thesis outlined above could be found. Man is a member of an estranged race, and as a result, he is prone to commit personal sin, to rationalize (speak lies) concerning his helplessness and dependence, and to go astray because he lacks the necessary organizing principle of his life.

In spite of the possibility of needless repetition in this particular section, the following summary may add a little light to the postulate which is defended here. Even as a member of a "fallen" race which is estranged or alienated from God, man's psychological structure remains—body, mind, and spirit. Nor is this structure intrinsically vitiated or debased; rather, it is perverted in its uses. Just as the psy-

chological structure of human nature remains, so man's relation to God remains, for as a man he is always related to God. "But the relation is perverted and the perversion militates toward perversity in all man's acts."<sup>64</sup>

#### VI. THE RELATIONSHIP OF INHERITED DEPRAVITY AND OVERT SIN

The sixth postulate of the position resulting from this investigation is the fact that overt sinning results from the covert disunity. It has already been indicated that man is not born with a sinful human nature, but he inherits a basic disorganization and disbalance within his human nature. To say that human nature can be reduced to three basic drives—the herd, the sex, and the self—is an oversimplification; nevertheless, for general purposes these three drives do sufficiently indicate the major areas of human nature. If man's nature is depraved or disintegrated, there must be a basic disbalance with regard to these three basic drives. Empirical evidence would indicate that the basic unbalance which arises by man's position under God as an alien, minimizes the herd and over-emphasizes the self drives. This would give to depravity a positive aspect of selfishness which arises from the prior negative aspect—the withdrawal of God's Spirit. Man's overt sin, consequently, is basically selfish action arising from his covert disunity.

Why should the herd instinct be minimized any more than the self instinct? Herbert H. Farmer provides a plausible answer in his recent volume, *God and Men*. According to Dr. Farmer, each person is an independent source of activity which is neither accessible nor controllable by another person. Nevertheless, the two are indissolubly bound to one another, condition one another, and are inescapable from each other. The dilemma, therefore, in a social situation is the fact that individuals are free from each other, yet are bound to one another. How, then, can two or more wills,

<sup>62</sup> Romans 3:23.

<sup>63</sup> Psalms 58:3.

<sup>64</sup> Hopper, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

two independent personalities, ever achieve a unity or harmony with one another?<sup>65</sup>

The answer lies in the "claim" of each person on the other. This is a mutual recognition that each must be under a certain restraint or constraint which recognizes the other as an independent person. This "relationship of claim-upon-one-another is part of the essential constitution and structure of the present world, and nothing can alter it . . ." <sup>66</sup> But to say that there is a claim—a mutual conditioning of two persons by one another—is to speak only of the ideal. In practical life these claims often clash. The only adequate solution can be found when

. . . persons acknowledge themselves to be, in their reciprocal claims, under a third and higher claim, which comprehends their claims upon one another and lays itself equally and impartially upon all in an absolute rule, the right of which to undeviating obedience neither questions.<sup>67</sup>

In other words, every finite person—by the very nature and constitution of the personal world as God has made it—stands in a dual *personal* relationship of claim: he is related at the same time and all the time to the claim of the infinite Person and to the claim of other finite persons.<sup>68</sup>

When the absolute, overall, third claim of God is disrupted, then all of the lesser claims on a finite level clash. The herd drive, therefore, becomes thwarted by conflict between persons and the self-drive takes the dominant position. Depravity is primarily a negation which inevitably gives rise to a positive egocentricity.

It might be argued that mankind need not be disorganized because he is alien from God. Cannot he become perfectly integrated about himself? Is not the ego an adequate center of life? It cannot be denied that egocentricity is the dominant characteristic of man without God, but rather than becoming an integrating principle, selfishness leads to further disintegration. True humanity is a "synthesis of the finite and the infinite, of limited knowledge and un-

limited capacity, of the contingent and the potential."<sup>69</sup> Boiled down to its essence, this merely means that man is a creature on the one hand, but has a capacity—necessarily must have the capacity—for God on the other. To deviate from this mean is to repudiate true humanity, and to abandon humanity can mean nothing other than the abandonment of the self to a policy of self-destruction. This is exactly what happens when the self becomes exalted as its own center because the self then oversteps its creaturehood and attempts to universalize its capacity for the infinite. Egocentricity inevitably leads the self to tyranny over others, becoming hateful thereby; and "it becomes hateful on its own account because it loves itself and no others, and is therefore not lovable."<sup>70</sup> "The true center of the self is not in itself but in God. True self-knowledge is to know that not in ourselves do we find truth. True wisdom consists in being rightly related to God."<sup>71</sup> Augustine gave classic expression to this view in his famous statement, "Thou awakest us to delight in Thy praise; for Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee."<sup>72</sup> Hence, to attempt a complete integration about the ego as the center of life is a short-cut to self-destruction and disorganization.

Man is not guilty of the negative aspect of depravity or the disorganization of his nature as a result of the demerit of the original sin, but he soon becomes culpable and guilty of the positive aspect. There comes a time when he must either choose to renounce his egocentricity and accept the means of reconciliation which God has provided through Christ, or he must give his personal approbation of his self will in rebellion against the divine will. Wesley admits that men are not personally guilty of Adam's original sin. The full sense of guilt can arise from no other source than the actual sins of the individual. Hence,

<sup>69</sup> Hopper, *op. cit.*, p. 290.

<sup>70</sup> *Loc. cit. et. seq.*

<sup>71</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>72</sup> Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1909), p. 1.

<sup>65</sup> Farmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 56f.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

God is never responsible for eternal damnation; it is contingent upon personal responsibility. Actual sin, for which each individual is responsible, is said to result from the demerit of the original sin, but if Adam's sin alone is the cause of all actual sin then he alone is guilty.

"But this is not the case: by the grace of God we may cast away our transgressions: therefore, if we do not, they are chargeable on ourselves . . . By grace we may conquer this inclination; or we may choose to follow it, and so commit actual sin."<sup>73</sup>

Man who inherits an alienation from God, and who finds that the center of his being is thus disintegrated, soon finds it difficult to abstain from intentional and volitional breaking of God's law. In fact, he is helpless to do otherwise apart from divine grace. The apostle Paul was vividly aware of this plight when he wrote:

So this is my experience of the Law: I desire to do what is right, but wrong is all that I can manage; I cordially agree with God's law, so far as my inner self is concerned, but then I find another law in my members which conflicts with the law of my mind and makes me a prisoner to sin's law that resides in my members.<sup>74</sup>

Paul was simply saying here that through his distinctively human propensity of self-transcendence he may transcend the natural processes and detect the alternatives presented to him; he may foresee the caprices and perils of the human situation, yet he is involved in them and of himself cannot extricate himself from them.<sup>75</sup> As a dependent and finite creature he could sense the hollow void of a disintegrated life or a life partially organized around the inadequate demands of self, yet, involved as he was in an alien race he could not grasp that source of organization for which his constitution was designed. His cry of despair is contemporary with every serious minded individual, "O wretched

man that I am! who shall deliver me . . ." The glorious fact for the whole of the alienated race is expressed in Paul's reply to his own question, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."<sup>76</sup>

## VII. CHRIST AND RESTORATION

The last conclusion of this paper is: Man needs redemption in two ways: (1) As a moral person and a responsible sinner before God he needs to be forgiven and united with God. (2) As a disrupted person, he needs to have his being reorganized, integrated, and made complete through the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in his life, and the simplification of his motives to one—perfect love.

It has been indicated that man may recognize his plight and wish it were otherwise, but still he is unable to do anything about it. Redemption, therefore, must be something other than the mere persuasion of man that he needs to reform and to reaffirm his dependence. God could not, by the very holiness, justice, and love of his being, simply forget the whole thing and arbitrarily set man right again; and, since man is unable to meet the justice of God by his very finiteness as well as by his undone, disorganized condition, the whole problem of a restoration of the fellowship between God and man reaches an apparent *impasse*. Apparently if anything was ever to be done, it must be done upon the initiative by God. Hence, God provided the plan whereby God and man combine. It is necessary that a man meet God's judicial requirement, yet God alone is able to do it. The perfect answer was Christ Jesus—the *Deus-homo*.

Man did not lose his faculties or his essential constitution; therefore he is ever a self-determining and self-transcending individual. Christ bridged the gap between God and man, but man has still to choose to meet the conditions of that reconciliation. If he determines to continue in his state of disintegration and self-will, he continues to be alienated and to commit actual

<sup>73</sup> John Wesley, "The Doctrine of Original Sin, according to Scripture, Reason, and Experience," *The Works of Reverend John Wesley*. (First American complete and standard edition, New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh, 1831), V, 548.

<sup>74</sup> Moffatt, *op. cit.*, Romans 7:21-23.

<sup>75</sup> Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

<sup>76</sup> Moffatt, *op. cit.*, Romans 7:24, 25.

sin. On the other hand, he may admit his dependence, renounce his egocentric living, repent of his actual sin, and submit himself to God. By so doing, he discovers the life for which he was constituted; he discovers the profound truth that to find his life he must "lose himself."

This experience of conversion reinstates man with God; his sins are forgiven. Such an experience can only come by faith. Faith is a perfect trust in Christ which involves the whole man as a *gestalt*, which presupposes that he senses a moral need and has repented for his personal sin. It provokes the feeling of both duty and love toward Christ. The sinner is then said to be justified which means that God, because of the death of Christ, and "on condition of a repentant sinner's faith in Christ as his divine Savior, receives him into full favor."<sup>77</sup> But action within God's attitude toward man is not the whole of conversion; it further involves a psychological new birth, i.e. an alteration in the  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  of each repentant sinner, known as regeneration:

Regeneration is the primary reorganization of a person's entire motive-life by the vital action and abiding presence of the Holy Spirit so that the ultimate motive is loyalty to Jesus Christ.<sup>78</sup>

Brunner and Niebuhr both feel that this experience of regeneration can never be complete in this life. Christ is merely a hope, not a possession; perfection can never pass beyond the stage of intention into reality; release of tension is possible in a partial way, but the peace of achievement must be reserved until this mortality shall put on immortality. The separation from God can be overcome in faith, in principle, but not in actual consequences.<sup>79</sup>

There is a sense in which the consequences of the alienation from God cannot be wholly overcome. Mankind will never be free from mistakes and limited knowledge. His being is never integrated fully and to the last degree. Death, a consequence of this alienation, awaits saint and

sinner alike. Nevertheless, there is an area in man's moral life where his motives become single, where the integration of his human nature is perfected to the point that his sole volitional intent is to do the whole will of God and to serve Him with perfect love. In a word, there is a second definite step in salvation where regeneration reaches a point of completion in the area indicated above. There can be a final integration in human motive.

Niebuhr and Brunner correctly maintain that the capacity to sin is always present with man as long as he lives in this world. It is quite true that the capacity for new evil will never be avoided by grace; for as long as the self remains within the twofold condition of involvement in natural processes and of transcendence over them, it will be subject to "falling" again into sin.<sup>80</sup> Niebuhr seems to confuse this capacity to sin with the demerit of sin itself, but the capacity to sin and depravity are not synonymous.

If Kierkegaard's assertion be true, that temptation presupposes sin, and that a person could never be tempted if he were free from it,<sup>81</sup> then Christian perfection would be utterly impossible, and Niebuhr would be correct. The wholly regenerated or entirely sanctified person can be tempted, *often by his virtues clamoring to be exercised*. In other words, he may be tempted through the legitimate claims of his human nature in a manner similar to the temptation of Adam and Eve.

Temptation, however, does not presuppose sin in the nature. The New Testament writer, James, gives the following insight into temptation:

. . . but each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire. Then desire when it has conceived gives birth to sin; and sin when it is full-grown brings forth death.<sup>82</sup>

It might be claimed that "his own desire" refers to the old principle of depravity still

<sup>77</sup> Niebuhr, *loc. cit.*

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151.

<sup>79</sup> *The New Covenant Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ* (Revised standard edition, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946), James 1:14, 15.

<sup>77</sup> Curtis, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 365.

<sup>79</sup> Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 488; Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

evident, but such an interpretation would violate the whole tenor of the New Testament which is in favor of the resolving of this depraved condition. Temptation may arise from man's morally neutral human nature. Whether or not temptation becomes sin depends upon whether the individual yields to these legitimate desires in the direction of evil or toward that which is good. Even after entire sanctification a man is capable of thus "falling" and becoming involved again in a state of alienation from God, for just as Adam and Eve were disobedient through perverting the virtue of self-determination, so might anyone else be disobedient and commit an "original sin" by deviating from the will of God. It would be original in the sense that it would originate another alienation from God's fellowship. Thus, temptation is not a sin for it grows out of legitimate desire; but it may lead to an unholy and perverted expression, and become sin.

Even though the possibility of sinning remains, the disintegrated human nature is capable also of being made whole again. Granted that this restoration would amount to a finite perfection, a relative perfection; granted that problems in connection with the self and society will always remain; nevertheless, the whole nature once again can be set into proper balance, and man's will can be aligned with God's will. It is only at the completion of regeneration—usually called entire sanctification—that the Holy Spirit has intimate fellowship as an indwelling presence in man and full integration takes place. This ideal may become existential and empirical, and need not be a mere hope or intention.

Mistakes may be made through physical frailty and misunderstanding, but the will can be unswerving in its fidelity to do as much as finitely possible with the aid of the indwelling Holy Spirit to bring every part of the human nature into complete surrender to the will of God. It is only by this complete subjection of the arrogant human will to the divine will that life in its fullness, life abundant, will ever be reached. Then, and only then, can man live in harmony with God and with himself.

What differentiates the two experiences of conversion and complete regeneration or entire sanctification? Curtis interprets the saving faith involved in the initial experience of regeneration as a loyalty toward Christ which includes a feeling of both duty and love. The element of duty is the stronger of these two aspects in loyalty to Christ. Yet duty implies a conflict, for the sense of "what ought to be" and the "what is" are often widely separated. "In his life of struggle to do his duty he cannot organize his inner personal life. He has the beginning, the ground plan . . . of an organism," but he is too preoccupied with his duty to carry out this plan.<sup>83</sup> Regeneration reaches its completion in personal holiness where this motive of loyalty is transformed from a dual motive into a simple motive of pure love. The ethical quality of duty is as strong as ever, but it is engulfed in an overpowering moral love. "The holy person does not do things because it is his duty to do them, but because he loves to do them."<sup>84</sup> It is only in this atmosphere of perfect love that the Spirit can have free access to fully integrate the disorganized or depraved human nature and to re-establish intimate fellowship with the human spirit.

The core of the whole matter may be summed up in this concept of love. Christ enunciated the law of love by which man was created to live when he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."<sup>85</sup> Man was made to love God with all of his powers. This would result in the corollary law of loving one's neighbor as himself. Sin or selfishness perverted this love principle and rather than being properly balanced by being integrated around Perfect Love—God's fellowship with man in the Person of the Holy Spirit—man became engrossed in an inordinate self-love. Man consequently substituted self-assertiveness for obedience to the will of God. The process of integration wrought

<sup>83</sup> Curtis, *op. cit.*, p. 390.

<sup>84</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>85</sup> Matthew 22:37, 39.

by the 'second work of grace' can be said to be the reinstatement of Perfect Love as the center of man's moral life. The proper balance is then restored and man is once again capable of normal loving and living.

When depravity is removed, there is nothing taken from the human nature, for a man is just as human after the experience of integrating grace as before. In fact, humanity finds its originally intended norm in a reorganization of all of its traits with reference to righteousness.

Pride, perhaps closest to the very essence of sin of all human traits outside the dominion of grace, is restored to that proper self-regard without which even sainthood is unlovely; anger directed under sin to the destruction of aught that checks the selfish will, under the fullness of grace becomes the temper of a sanctified will; lust, which under sin's dominion makes sensual pleasure the goal of desire, is transmuted by grace to the pure gold of love which embodies not merely in a physical form but in a person—one person—its affection, and sacrifices its all to that person's welfare.<sup>86</sup>

This is not, however, the end of the process; it is rather the opening of a new life which requires constant adjustment and commitment to the will of God. Self-surrender must be continuous. Daily one must surrender to God's will, never assuming control himself.

It is easy to become engrossed in one aspect of Christianity and to overlook some of the other necessary aspects of a well-balanced spiritual life. The apostle Paul realized the danger of becoming one-sided in Christian living when he wrote I Corinthians 13. An analysis by James Stewart points out that Paul began this great chapter by distinguishing between the vital element of the religion of Christ and those gifts and graces which are a part of that religion, but which, when taken by themselves, may prove to become more of a snare than an adornment:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels"—that is religion as ecstatic emotionalism. "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and

<sup>86</sup> Leslie Ray Marston, *From Chaos to Character* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Light and Life Press, 1944), p. 159.

understand all mysteries, and all knowledge"—that is religion as intellectualism, speculation. "Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains"—that is religion as working energy. "Though I bestow all my good to feed the poor"—that is religion as humanitarianism. "Though I give my body to be burned"—that is religion as asceticism.<sup>87</sup>

All of these are one-sided and inadequate representations when taken by themselves. The integrated Christian life includes all of these aspects in their proper relationship when organized around the vital element of Christian love.

The apostle Paul insists in Romans 13:14, "put on the character of the Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>88</sup> Christ becomes real and a vital part of life through full surrender and the infilling of the Holy Spirit. As he completely controls the life, it will not major on one aspect of Christianity, but will be unified about the principle of Perfect Love in its relationships both to God and man. As E. Stanley Jones has written:

If the Spirit lives within us, he will not make us other than Christlike. . . . Did Jesus ever go off into any visions or dreams? Did he ever traffic in the merely mysterious or occult? Was there anything psychopathic about him? Was he not always well poised, always balanced, always sane? Was he ever misled by a subordinate issue or did he ever take a bypath? Was there about him any rampant emotionalism? He was indeed tremendously emotional, but was it not restrained and directed emotion—directed toward human need? To ask these questions is to answer them. The Spirit was to be "another Comforter." Note the "another." He was to be just like Christ. And Christ, the Man of the Burning Heart, was also the Man of the Balanced Heart. So the Spirit brings poise, balance, integration, symmetry, and consequent power into the human life.<sup>89</sup>

No one would deny that emotions, the intellect, faith as working energy, humanitarianism, and asceticism all have value when properly related and controlled by the Holy Spirit. To surrender to this integrating Spirit is not only man's privilege but his duty, both to himself and to God.

<sup>87</sup> James Stewart, *A Man in Christ* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.), p. 1.

<sup>88</sup> Moffatt, *op. cit.*, Romans 13:14.

<sup>89</sup> E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of Every Road* (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930), p. 69f.