



# Discernment

SO THAT YOU MAY BE ABLE TO DISCERN WHAT IS BEST. PHIL. 1:10

## Contents

Is There Any Justice in Welfare Reform?  
pages 2

A Response to James Skillen  
pages 3-4

Thoughts on Welfare Reform  
pages 4-6

New NAC Members  
page 6

CACE News & Notes  
page 8



**Discernment aims to stimulate interest in the moral dimensions of contemporary issues; to provide a forum for Christian reflection; and to foster the teaching of Christian ethics across the curriculum. Published three times a year.**

**CACE Director:**  
Alan Johnson, Th.D.

**Editor:**  
Glenn Arnold, Ph.D.

**Consulting Editors:**  
Mark Amstutz, Ph.D.  
Alan Jacobs, Ph.D.  
Dennis Okholm, Ph.D.

**Editorial Staff:**  
Pat Reichhold

**Designer:**  
Ellen Rising Morris

**Research:**  
Christopher Bunn

## WELFARE REFORM: ANOTHER LOOK

**J**ust over one year ago, President Clinton signed into law the most sweeping changes in welfare legislation since the thirties. It may be still too early to assess the impact across the country on the various state, private, and religious based organizations. The 1996 welfare reform legislation has so far resulted in mixed changes. The long run impact remains unclear as states are still in the process of adjusting to the changes, though waivers have been granted to prevent some of the most immediate cuts from occurring. Dr. Helen Slessarev reports that most states have reported a 20 percent decline in their welfare caseloads from their peak in the early 1990s. Yet, it is unclear how much of that decline is the result of increased work or harsher sanctions being applied by state agencies. All states were required to impose a 60 month lifetime limit on the receipt of cash benefits. However, some states have set shorter time periods, and Wisconsin has already eliminated cash benefits altogether. Most states are still grappling with how they are going to implement the steep work requirements that mandate that they place 50 percent of their caseload into work activities by the year 2002.

The legislation cut \$28 billion in Food Stamps between now and 2002, much of it falling on legal immigrants. The impact on immigrants has created a tremendous rush of applications for United States citizenship, which the federal government has had difficulty in processing. Single adults without children had been limited to receiving Food Stamps for only three months out of every 36, but states have been allowed to apply for annual waivers to this.

James Skillen, Executive Director, Center for Public Justice, Washington, D.C., and Helen Slessarev, Director of Urban Studies, Wheaton College, in this issue discuss the question, 'Is there any justice in the new welfare system?' They represent opposing viewpoints as to what will happen.

Your responses to *Discernment* materials are very important to us. Therefore, in this issue we are publishing two reader letters, one from Joseph Overton of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, and one from Professor Ray Ortlund, Trinity International University, which comment on previous discussions in these pages. We hope their remarks will stir up yet further responses from you our readers.

Our next several issues will be devoted to the theme of "Ethics in Education." Is the goal and the process of education in various institutions, including the churches, morally right? We invite you to submit an original essay addressing some aspect of this theme (see the last page for details).

Finally, our expression of gratitude to Dr. Glenn Arnold for doing the fine job of editing this and the previous issue. We welcome back Dr. Mark Fackler who will be assuming his regular duties as editor in the next issue. ■

**"The lack of wealth is easily repaired; but the poverty of the soul is irreparable."**

—Montaigne

# Is there Any Justice in Welfare Reform?

by Dr. James W. Skillen

**T**he question before us is whether there is any justice in the latest round of welfare reform. The reform we chiefly have in mind is the federal law enacted last year called the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act." I want to answer that question with a qualified "yes," but also with a definite "not enough."

## The Justice Not Done

First, let's ask about the justice that has not yet been done. What injustice remains after enactment of the welfare reform law? I see three kinds or three dimensions of injustice.

There is, first of all, the fact that far too many citizens and members of Congress still seem to blame either government or an indifferent, antagonistic public for the dire state of poverty that exists in this country. Government is seen as either the chief cause of our problems or the primary solution to our problems. These are the voices at the opposite poles of the debate. Yet these two positions represent a failure to face up to the reality of poverty that can be addressed only at multiple levels of responsibility. There is not a single source to blame. Neither is there a single reform that will work. If we do not give up our simplistic moralisms, grave injustice will remain.

The second dimension of injustice that exists is the public's declining confidence in government itself. In part, this is due to the fact that government has sometimes overpromised solutions to problems like poverty, promising to end it, for example. When people lose confidence in government to such an extent that they no longer expect it even to perform its proper tasks, then injustice will remain, because government has the responsibility to establish and enforce justice.

Finally, and most pointedly, the 1996 welfare-reform law had more to do with trying to cut the federal budget and to turn over responsibility to the states than it did with creative reform of the welfare system. The 1996 law is not so much welfare reform as a call to the states to try to create welfare reform. Good reform might come, and the states might be the best place to try out some new programs, but the fact is that welfare reform has not yet taken place at the national level, and therefore, justice has not yet been done.

## Justice Done and Promised

On a positive note, I see three signs of hope in the process now under way to reform welfare.

First, many public officials and agencies are recognizing that non-government (often faith-based) service organizations are accomplishing things that government-run

programs are not. Public authorities are becoming more conscious that many causes of poverty have a moral and personal root that public funding cannot touch. More funding for more government programs cannot, in itself, provide the solution. We see in this growing recognition a greater awareness of human social complexity, of the diverse responsibilities that individuals and institutions bear. This is the beginning of greater justice, because more people are now confronting reality.

Second, the problems of deep and persistent poverty cannot be gauged by an economic measuring stick that merely tells us who falls below the poverty line. People are poor for different reasons, and welfare programs designed so that one size fits all will not help some people. The fact that public officials are now trying to deal with different people in different ways and seeking partnerships with non-government organizations holds the promise of greater justice in the future.

Finally, the Charitable Choice provisions in the new welfare law go a long way to doing greater justice to religion in this country. These provisions, as discussed before in these pages, tell states not to discriminate against religious service providers and not to force religious groups to secularize themselves when they do participate in public programs. This is an important, though not sufficient, expansion of justice in the welfare system.



Dr. James W. Skillen

## The Challenge for Christians

Christians now have a big opportunity to try to strengthen justice and to overcome injustice as described above. This requires more than minor adjustments in our thinking and action. Fundamental changes are now taking place in the way government relates to the rest of society. We need to think new thoughts and to develop a more comprehensive public philosophy by which to make judgments in this regard. Professors and students at Christian colleges need to move to the forefront of creative thinking precisely because of their Christian view of life and not be satisfied with choosing sides among the simplistic moralisms and faulty views of the past. ■

**"The poor you will always have with you, and you can help them any time you want."**

—Mark 14:7[NIV]

*Dr. James W. Skillen is the Executive Director of the Center for Public Justice in Washington D.C.*

# Response to James Skillen

by Dr. Helene Slessarev

I believe that the welfare legislation passed last year will result in a tremendous increase in the amount of suffering and despair found today among poor Americans. Over the last couple of months, I have participated in a congressional task force convened by my congressman, Bobby Rush. As Congressman from Illinois' First Congressional District, he represents much of the south side of Chicago, which has one of the highest number of public aid recipients in the state. Last January, he convened a task force on welfare reform at which he brought a number of Chicago's public aid service providers. Since the beginning of the year, the dollars that these providers receive from public and private sources are being overwhelmed by the increased demand from destitute people. The food pantries, the people who provide emergency shelter, the people who provide substance abuse services, are finding themselves increasingly unable to meet today's demand. I think that the number of people in need is going to increase. With the end of public aid payments, we will see an increase in the number of homeless women and children.

One cannot discuss issues of poverty and welfare reform in the United States without discussing two issues of American life. One is the presence of racial bias in society, and the second is the transformation of the American economy and the loss of manufacturing jobs that has affected inner city communities. Until we, as a nation and as Christians, confront some of the consequences of both, it is difficult for us to engage in a conversation about what ought and ought not take place in the arena of welfare reform.

The U.S. has historically, at best, made a partial commitment to equality. In some cases, the policies such as The War on Poverty and the Great Society of the 1960s were carefully crafted so as to minimize their long term impact on the racial status quo in the big cities of the north. The Democrats, the main proponent of these programs in the 1960s, engaged in a balancing act between creating programs to uplift the poor, while also at the same time protecting their more favored constituents. And by 1966, the escalation of the war in Vietnam was already leading to a rollback of this brief period of reform and interest in urban poverty. By the time Richard Nixon was elected President in 1968, the idea of an urban policy initiated by the federal government was largely abandoned, and Nixon adopted essentially a black business program as his version of an urban policy.

I want to relate a quote from Rev. Martin Luther King, taken from his last book, written in 1967.



*Dr. Helene Slessarev*

With Selma and the Voting Rights Act one phase of development in the civil rights revolution came to an end. . . . For the vast majority of white Americans, the past decade—the first phase—had been a struggle to treat the Negro with a degree of decency, not of equality. White America was ready to demand that the Negro should be spared the lash of brutality and coarse degradation, but it had never been truly committed to helping him out of poverty, exploitation or all forms of discrimination.

Dr. King recognized that, despite his efforts in the South, conditions in the North had changed little. Housing segregation was intact; a dual labor market existed in which African-Americans were restricted to inferior jobs. Their children attended schools as segregated as those in the South. In Chicago, the big issue of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s was the issue of quality education and segregated schools. These conditions have continued to the present, with the city's still segregated schools descending into greater levels of dysfunction, to the point where many of the kids come out of these schools without a functional education that could bring them successfully into the labor market. These are issues left unresolved for over 30 years, allowing communities to deteriorate, allowing communities to suffer job losses, allowing schools to decline, while housing remains as segregated as ever.

Some of you know that I live in an all-black neighborhood on the south side. I hesitate to tell people, because white Chicagoans simply can't believe that I could be living in that neighborhood. Residential color lines in the city are, in many ways, as sharp as they were before. Today, urban poor communities, without an economic base, have been left vulnerable to every downturn in the national economy.

It has been estimated that between 30–50% of the employment gap between white and black youth can be explained by differences in job accessibility. Black youth don't have access to the same number of job opportunities as white youth do. A recent labor market study found that for every available entry level job in the Chicago labor market, there are six people waiting for that job. The loss of manufacturing and the high concentration of poorly trained African-Americans and Hispanics has placed the demographics and economics of American cities on a collision course. And I predict again that the current welfare reform bill will accelerate that collision course.

What would a true pledge to alleviate poverty look like? What is the solution? Are there solutions? I would argue that it would require a commitment to building, what I call, "structures of economic opportunity". Every economy has such structures. They are designed to ensure that each successive

generation will be able to reach a new level of economic security, something that our parents wished for us, and what we would wish for our children. For us, that is a realistic aspiration. But in poor communities, those structures are largely non-existent, or they are in disrepair, leaving many of the residents without any realistic avenue of self-sufficiency, not to mention upward mobility.

Based on America's legacy of racial oppression, I think these "structures of opportunity" for people of color must entail more than competent schools; they involve more than career training or child care or making job referrals, which is what the welfare service providers will talk about when they talk about the services they provide. It requires making a commitment to open up the entire metropolitan labor market, thereby bringing an end to the geographic and occupational segregation that exists. I'm a member of a church in Chicago where one of our social justice activities has been to partner with suburban churches and encourage them to open up their doors to residential access for people in Chicago. Unless you can say that Chicago's metropolitan economy is accessible to all its people, we are going to see poverty and unemployment in poor minority neighborhoods.

Until the means for building a self-sustaining life for yourself and your family is made available to everyone in society, we cannot talk about welfare reform.

When the Clinton Administration first began to examine the issue of welfare reform following the 1992 elections, the President convened a task force to look at it. The task force recommended that there had to be a publicly funded employment component to any realistic welfare reform. Once you look at job creation you discover that the cost of creating jobs in communities where there are none is greater than the cost of continuing to provide meager public assistance benefits.

In an era of budget cuts, the willingness to create these opportunities are not there because our primary policy effort, on the part of both political parties, is to reduce the deficit. That does not leave room for the initiatives needed to create what I am talking about. As a result, we have a one-sided welfare reform where the benefits are cut, but none of the structures needed to develop economic self-sufficiency have been put into place because they are too costly for us as a nation at this time.

This raises serious moral questions about the extent to which we are going to alter our priorities. Are we going to emphasize economic growth in ways that we individually prosper, or should we balance economic growth with priorities that would guarantee increased economic access to those who have the least in this society right now? I believe that the Bible instructs us to look at the "least of these", and to see Christ there, to see how His ministry involved outreach to those who had the least in society. We have to ask ourselves, do we follow the mandate that Christ has given to us? ■

*Dr. Helene Slessarev is the Director of Urban Studies at Wheaton College.*

## **An essay written by Joseph P. Overton in response to the welfare reform debate featured in the fall 1996 edition of *Discernment*.**

**D***iscernment* summarized well the major arguments being discussed today regarding assistance to the poor—which is both the publication's strength and weakness. A strength because it is a fine summary of the popular debate, a weakness because I believe that much of the popular debate is founded on flawed political and economic assumptions. I lack the time to address these matters in detail, but here are a few thoughts.

To Dr. Sherman's four moral priorities, I add a fifth: people must develop a systematic and intellectually rigorous definition of proper government action based on sound biblical principles, political theory, and economic understanding. Many of the current welfare problems stem from sincere people who are ignorant of these areas of knowledge and end up supporting programs based on an emotional response or a vague sense of justice. Such programs often contradict what I believe are well-established moral, economic, and legal principles. Governmental authority is a threshold question in any policy analysis, and yet it is usually treated superficially (as it is in this publication) or ignored.

For example, Dr. Sherman states "Saving money shouldn't be that big a priority, since such a relatively small portion of the federal budget goes to welfare anyway." (I will leave aside a discussion of the accuracy of the statement, except to say that most who repeat this refrain count only AFDC and food stamps, and ignore the other 72 means-tested federal programs that range from housing to medical care, as well as Social Security and Medicare. Many people vehemently object when the latter two programs are classified as welfare because they mistakenly believe that the recipients have "invested" in these programs, rather than recognize their true nature as inter-generational transfer schemes. Dr. Sherman also avoids mention of the tremendous impact of federal law on state welfare spending, most notably the Medicaid program.)

Dr. Sherman seems to assume that the federal government has legal authority to create or administer a welfare program, and with this I disagree. The U.S. Constitution grants to the federal government only limited jurisdiction; that is, Congress has only those powers that are explicitly granted to it. Other powers are left to the people or to the states. This is a well-established principle of Constitutional jurisprudence and was interpreted strictly until the 1930s. At that time the Supreme Court began a gradual erosion of this framework, to the point that even though Congress is not granted the power to establish welfare programs, they were justified under—unbelievably—the Interstate Commerce Clause! (Let's have a discussion sometime regarding moral relativism, FDR's court-packing scheme, constitutional interpretation, the Commerce Clause, *Wickard vs. Filburn*, and classical, modern, and post-modern political science). Dr. Sherman's first priority is honesty; and I

believe any intellectually honest person who studies the issue will find that, if our Constitution is to have meaning, there is no federal authority for welfare programs. We should be urging the U.S. Supreme Court to return to an honest interpretation of this document. (A couple years ago, in *U.S. vs. Lopez*, the Supreme Court—for the first time in 60 years—struck down a federal law based on lack of congressional authority. I hope they continue to restore the integrity of the Constitution and return proper authority to the American people and the states).

Regardless of the federal constitutional question, Dr. Sherman believes that it is consonant with Christian principles for government to take, under the threat of fine or imprisonment, justly acquired property from one individual and redistribute it to others. With this I also disagree.

Most people start their analysis of this issue by reasoning “If the government didn’t do it, I don’t see how it would get done; therefore, the government must do it.” As a Christian who believes in an omnipotent God, I believe the proper place to start our analysis is with the biblical foundations of government, on which we construct our framework for political morality. If a social problem falls outside the proper province of government action, we must trust God to use His people and His Church to solve it, not question His ability and transgress the proper boundaries of governmental authority.

I was astounded by Dr. Sherman’s bald assertion regarding the capabilities of the Church and other private charitable groups to meet human needs. To wit: “[T]here are basic things they will not be able to handle, and it’s not realistic to suggest that private groups can completely replace the government welfare system.” She mentions mentally and physically disabled folks and orphans as particularly vulnerable, but I do not see where God has so limited His body. I would like to understand her reasoning and empirical evidence for this claim of impotence. If the Church is not meeting these needs, perhaps we should redouble our efforts and commitment to building the Church instead of running to government. Could this be the reason why the Church is increasingly irrelevant in our culture, while secular government authority is everywhere expanding?

Despite these comments, I feel Dr. Sherman’s article was quite fine. It’s just that she, like many others, provides no systematic justification for involving government in welfare programs.

Dr. Primus’s article suffers from the same disabilities. He wants government to provide food, shelter, and clothing. He uses the common justification that since we live in a fallen world, government must step in with welfare programs. I am always amused when I run across this argument. Because we are fallen people, we need to take some of our resources and liberty and give it to other fallen people—and fallen people in Washington, D.C., no less! This reflects the prevailing attitude in contemporary political science which views government as a benevolent supra-individual which acts in the public interest. When there is “market failure” or some other shortcoming in private institutions, altruistic government will step in and correct it.

I believe this is, again, a flawed assumption. Government is populated with fallen people, as are communities, churches,

businesses, and families. There is a growing literature in a relatively new field of political economy called Public Choice theory which applies economic analysis to behavior in political markets, i.e., democratic government. It is a fascinating approach, and economist James Buchanan won the 1986 Nobel prize in economics for his pioneering work. He argues, quite convincingly, that people do not become saints when they are elected, appointed, or employed by government. They still have the same fleshly desires for fame, fortune, status, control, security and power. And furthermore, the nature of the interests and incentives in the political process, and the quality of the information, all make the effectiveness of political solutions very suspect. (There is an entire literature here which policy people should be familiar with. Let’s talk about it sometime, including some of the political dynamics of poverty legislation.)

Reflect on the sentiments above. As Jesus said, “the poor will always be with us.” Up until the early 20th century, social assistance in the United States was predominately a local responsibility, that of extended families, local churches, para-church organizations, secular charities, fraternal organizations, and local government. Did they eliminate poverty? No, just as Jesus predicted. Could they have done more? Of course. Did they make society worse off? No, they made it better off by addressing the majority of the problem.

Compare the federal war on poverty which set out to eliminate poverty. Did they eliminate poverty? No, just as Jesus predicted. Could they have done more? I don’t see how. These programs have spent over \$5 trillion dollars since 1965 for every conceivable type of assistance program. Did they make society worse off? I and many others argue that they clearly did.

As several of the *Discernment* authors note, there are a variety of perverse incentives involved in current public assistance programs that have fostered dependency, promiscuity, illegitimacy, and a host of other social pathologies.

These incentives are virtually nonexistent in the private relief programs I am familiar with. I have traveled the world and visited areas of Asia, Africa, and South America that were absolutely destitute, but I have always seen a richness of character in the people despite their physical poverty—except where there is government dependency like in the United States. There is much to commend the simple notion that sometimes it is better to live having solved 85 percent of the problem, than to make matters worse by trying to solve 100 percent of it.

**“Though the people support the government, the government should not support the people.”**

—Grover Cleveland



# CACE's National Advisory Council Welcomes New Members

by Glenn F. Arnold, Professor of Journalism, Wheaton College

*CACE has been enriched by the presence of two gifted people who have joined its National Advisory Council. Michelle Causey-Drake and David McFadzean are already participating in the discussions at CACE.*

## Mischelle Causey-Drake

Ms. Causey-Drake is an attorney who, after working as Counsel for the Administrator for the Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission of the Illinois Supreme Court, joined two other Christian colleagues to form JDS Mediation Services, Inc., in Chicago. As Christian attorneys, Mischelle and her partners wanted to do something different.



Mischelle Causey-Drake

"Recognizing that many situations were best handled in a non-adversarial forum, we wanted to give people an alternative to the litigation process," Mischelle says. Thus JDS Mediation Services, a full service dispute resolution firm providing arbitration, mediation, system design, and training and development, was formed.

JDS Mediation provides services to Chicago public schools, businesses, churches and couples. One of the church training curriculum "Pathways to Peace: Resolving Conflicts God's Way," focuses on a number of issues Christians are confronted with when addressing conflict, including the issue of forgiveness. JDS also offers "Peacemakers 2000: Visions of a King," an antiviolence program presented in the public school system. "I view each work experience as an opportunity to minister to others."

Mischelle has already participated in meetings of CACE's National Advisory Council, and she is looking forward to her continued involvement.

"I realized it was an excellent opportunity to participate in an environment that would allow me to use my legal background in ethics as well as be a part of a ministry beyond my professional career," she says.

*continued from page 5*

I find little convincing evidence that had we not created the welfare state, Americans would have suddenly ceased their century-and-a-half-old tradition of amazing generosity and world-renowned voluntary associations and let their fellow countrymen wallow in poverty and misery. My belief is that absent the welfare state we would have a much stronger, much more Godly society, with less physical and behavioral poverty than we have today.

In sum, I believe much of today's social problems stem from a failure to understand the proper role of government in society.

## David McFadzean

The newest member of CACE's National Advisory Council is a playwright, television producer, and writer. David McFadzean serves as Executive producer and co-creator of the television series, "Home Improvement." His new program, "Soul Man," starts this fall and stars Dan Ackroyd.

David earned his bachelor's degree at the University of Evansville (Indiana) and received his master's degree in acting from Illinois State University. He met his wife at ISU; and, since she was also a Christian and an actress, they said, "We must do something for the Lord."



David McFadzean

For two years they traveled across the United States in a Volkswagon minibus putting on a show they called "Family Bible Jamboree." The McFadzeans then worked for the next six years with the Lambs Players in San Diego. Then they moved to Elgin, Illinois where David taught drama at Judson College.

While at Judson, a friend asked David to help write a pilot script for a television series. He did, and the program turned out to be "Rosanne."

"My entire life had changed," he recalls. "I was no longer working in the church." He soon realized that he was the only Christian working on that television show, and he wondered why. "Somewhere along the line, Christians opted out of entertainment, out of theater, out of drama, out of the storytelling business to the culture at large, and into the consumer area. Christians became disgruntled consumers."

Dr. James Young, professor emeritus of theater at Wheaton College, introduced McFadzean to CACE.

"I want to help students," David says. He wants to give Christian college students some idea of what working in the entertainment world is like. He hopes to relate how other Christians have handled tough, ethical decisions in Hollywood and New York City.

Viewing his seat on the National Advisory Council, McFadzean says, "I am a person who, probably as much as anyone else, needs ethical training. I hope that I can get as much out of this as I can give to it." ■

Many people actually pride themselves on being "moderate" and "non-ideological," both of which they feel characterize the thoughtful, objective, reasonable, citizen. In my experience, however, this most often indicates a person who has never taken the time to become educated in systematic political economy. Such people are dangerous policy makers, and I see the casualties of their work everyday. ■

*Joseph P. Overton is the Senior Vice President at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy.*

# What I Really Believe

by Dr. Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr., Trinity International University

In the Winter, 1996, issue of *Discernment*, Dr. Ruth Tucker represents me as holding to certain views which I have never believed or taught. Because space is limited, I will call attention only to the most important point of clarification.

In the course of my essay in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, I propose, among other things, that Adam "abandoned his post as head" during the temptation of Genesis 3:1-6. Noting that, Dr. Tucker writes: "Concerning Adam's sin, Ortlund [*sic*] writes that Adam's abandoning 'his post as head was wrong,'" Dr. Tucker then draws the following inference:

If Adam's abandoning his post as head was wrong, and if this was something that God had condemned in the beginning, this should correctly be regarded as sin, *which would mean that Adam sinned before the fall.* (emphasis added)

Adam sinned before the fall? I do not believe that, I have never taught it, and it is not entailed in what I do affirm.

Significantly, the way I am quoted gives no indication that my argument is grounded in a careful reading of the biblical text. But Genesis 3:17 reads:

And to the man he said,  
"Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, 'You shall not eat it,' cursed is the ground because of you." (NRSV)

Strikingly, God includes not one but two explanatory clauses before pronouncing the curse. In view of Genesis 2:17, one would have expected Genesis 3:17 simply to say:

And to the man he said,  
"Because you have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, 'You shall not eat of it,' cursed is the ground because of you."

But, in fact, God includes two reasons for the curse:

And to the man he said,  
"Because [1] you have listened to the voice of your wife, and [2] have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, 'You shall not eat of it,' cursed is the ground because of you."

Obviously, Adam's fault was not that he listened respectfully to his wife in the normal course of daily life, as every husband ought to do. So why does Adam's "listening to the voice of his wife" draw down God's wrath? This is especially intriguing since no conversation between Adam and his wife is recorded in the temptation scene of Genesis 3:1-6.

The expression, "listening to the voice of [someone]," intimates more than the giving of one's attention; it intimates the yielding of one's obedience. This I interpret as Adam's "abandoning his post as head." But the fact that these two explanatory clauses introduce the cursing of the ground suggests that *both* factors are prompting God to pronounce the curse. The actual events in the narrative of the fall, along with the fact that these two explanatory clauses lie side-by-side,

suggest that Adam's "listening to the voice of his wife" and his eating of the forbidden tree were inextricably bound together as two aspects of one and the same fall, which together warranted the curse upon the ground.

Therefore, Dr. Tucker's inference that "Adam sinned before the fall" (her words) when he "abandoned his post as head" (my words) by listening to the voice of his wife does not follow. ■

## Back Issues *Discernment*

Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 1992  
***On Being Truthful***

Vol. 1, No. 2, Spring 1992  
***AIDS***

Vol. 1, No. 3, Fall 1992  
***Legalized  
Physician-Assisted Suicide***

Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring 1993  
***Tough Choices in Health Care***

Vol. 2, No. 2, Winter 1994  
***Moral Pluralism***

Vol. 2, No. 3, Spring/Fall 1994  
***Activism, Protest, and Dissent***

Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter 1995  
***Saving Our Planet, Christian Ethics  
and the Environment***

Vol. 3, No. 2, Spring 1995  
***Greed, Generosity, and  
a Few Other Notes and Helps***

Vol. 3, No. 3, Fall 1995  
***Renewing Earth  
and Rebuilding Culture***

Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter 1996  
***Valuing Families and Family Values***

Vol. 4, No. 2, Spring 1996  
***On Being Civil***

Vol. 4, No. 3, Fall 1996  
***Welfare Reform: Issues of Justice and Love***

To subscribe, send check for \$5 for one year (three issues) or \$8 for two years (six issues) to  
**CACE, Wheaton College, 501 E. College,  
Wheaton, IL 60187-5593**

## CACE News and Notes

CACE sponsored a public forum on November 13, 1997, on the topic, "Should Christians Leave the Public Schools?" Three individuals represented three different positions, each person favoring either public schools, private schools, or home schooling. They presented their cases and discussed the moral issues involved. Audio and video tapes are available upon request. For ordering information, please call 630-752-5886.

We are interested in your comments and contributions on anything discussed in these pages or on any aspect of applied Christian ethics. Our theme emphasis on campus and in publications for the 1997–1998 school year is "Ethics in Education." Thoughtful, cutting edge articles, not previously published [1000–2000 words] from your discipline or area of experience will be considered for publication. ■

**The Center for Applied Christian Ethics is on-line, including recent issues of Discernment! Tell your friends. Watch for upcoming current issues pages with Dr. Koop and others responding.**

**<http://www.wheaton.edu:80/CACE>**

## CACE Monograph Booklets

- **On Being Truthful**, by Lewis Smedes, Ph.D. (1991)
- **Is There a Right to Health Care?** by David B. Fletcher, Ph.D. (1991)
- **The Bible, Ethics, and Health Care: Theological Foundations for a Christian Perspective on Health Care**, by John F. Kilner, Ph.D. (1991)
- **The Sin of Greed and the Spirit of Christian Generosity**, by Robert C. Roberts, Ph.D. (1994)
- **Understanding and Responding to Moral Pluralism**, by Alister McGrath, Ph.D. (1994)
- **Distinctive Responsibility for the Environment: A Christian Perspective**, by Susan Power Bratton, Ph.D. (1995)
- **Understanding Homosexuality**, by Gilbert Bilezikian, Ph.D., Stanton Jones, Ph.D., Don E. Workman, Ph.D., Dallas Willard, Ph.D., and Judy-Rae Karlsen (revised 1995)

(Cost is \$3 per booklet, \$4 for **Understanding Homosexuality**)

Order these booklets by writing to:

CACE  
Wheaton College  
501 E. College  
Wheaton, IL 60187-5593



CACE, Dr. Alan Johnson

Bulk Rate  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Wheaton, IL  
Permit No. 392

