

A Limiting Effect of our Experience on our Perception of the Meaning of the Command to Preach the Word

By Joel C. Gerlach

[Presented to the Missionaries' Conference at St. Andrew's, Sacramento, January 26-27, 1982]

In April of 1981, National Family Opinion of Toledo, Ohio, completed its tabulation of data collected in an opinion survey of members of WELS churches. I happened to have been one of the 1600 members of the Synod to be included to the survey. The results of that survey are now in the hands of the Conference of Presidents for study and appropriate action.

Seven other Lutheran church bodies were included in that survey. Last July John P. O'Hara, the Research Coordinator for the Office of Research and Planning of the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, published the results of the survey of LC-MS members in a document entitled "Profiles of Lutherans, 1980: Preliminary Comparison Between the LC-MS and Total Lutheran Samples."

Since the results from the survey of WELS members are unavailable, I have chosen to use figures from the O'Hara report to make a point. I think that when you examine the figures, you will agree that WELS statistics are not likely to be significantly different from those of the LCMS (See Addenda).

Note that more than half of our members have not made a personal witness of their faith to strangers during the past year, and that 67.6% have not done so to acquaintances. Close to half are unwilling to discuss their faith with strangers. I seriously doubt that anyone would disagree with the observation that our reluctance as Lutherans to actively speak about our faith to others is displeasing to the one who said, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me."

The Jan. 8, 1982, issue of the *Lutheran Standard* contains a lead article entitled, "Witness? We Know That We Should, But Where Do We Begin?" It focuses on the same problem the O'Hara report does: "Most of us have trouble sharing the faith with others.... We're often afraid even to speak of our Lord to conversation.... We feel awkward about doing evangelism and simply would rather leave it to somebody else."

Citing statistical findings among Lutherans similar to O'Hara's, the authors state, "Studies of Lutherans reveal that 50% never talk about their faith to the unchurched. Another 40% rarely do this. It is fair to say that 90% of us Lutherans do not intentionally reach out to the unchurched with the gospel." Why not? The authors suggest that "we are products of our heritage," and they go on to explain what that means, concluding that the problem is an attitudinal one. "Even when thinking about unchurched people, our attitude often has been: 'They know where we are. They can come if they want to be a part of the church.'"

I agree with authors Markquart and Malmo. But in my judgment, their analysis does not go far enough. They suggest that "our heritage is basically European, a culture looked upon as Christian. When Lutherans came to the United States and duplicated the European situation, our subculture was Christian. This meant that we Lutherans were not in a situation where we were forced to speak the gospel to a secular, unbelieving society." I submit that if that is true for the ALC, it is equally true of us. In fact, because we have tended to be more parochial than the ALC, it is probably more characteristic of WELS Lutherans than it is of ALC Lutherans.

Now to repeat, the Markquart-Malmo analysis makes a valid point. But it does not go far enough. An attitudinal problem traceable to our heritage? Yes, in part. But there is more to it than that. It is possible that the ecclesiastical culture out of which most of us have come has had a limiting effect on our perception of what it means to "preach the Word," or "to teach all nations." I want to explore that possibility with you now.

Thematically stated the subject of this presentation comes out like this: *A Limiting Effect of our Experience on our Perception of the Meaning of the Lord's Command to "Preach the Word."* We intend to define what preaching the Word means, and then to suggest what some of the consequences are of limiting the

meaning. The conclusion I will draw is that our perception must change before the attitude of our people will change with regard to gospel outreach in our churches.

Popular Attitudes (and Clerical)

It may be somewhat crude to characterize the attitude of our people about the unchurched as, “They know where we are. They can come if they want to be a part of the church.” But that kind of thinking, whether expressed in just that way or not, does sometimes surface among our people, even among pastors. A related attitude less crudely put is sometimes expressed like this: The Lord asks us only to sow the seed of the Word. The rest is up to him.

That is true enough when our reason for saying it is to express the biblical truth concerning the power inherent in God’s Word. Whatever results the Word produces it produces because God works in and through his Word (Jn 6:63, Rm 10:17, et al.). But when a person says that to rationalize an ineffectual outreach to the unchurched, it frequently reveals an inadequate perception of what it means to sow the Seed, one that is influenced by the way we have observed the preaching and teaching of God’s Word in our own experience as WELS Lutherans. Emphasizing that “the rest is up to him” also obviates the need to ask ourselves whether we are employing appropriate ways to sow the Seed.

It is time to eliminate the metaphors and to try to be more explicit. Two observations require our consideration. 1. To say that “all we are asked to do is sow the Seed” suggests an understanding of preaching the Word primarily to terms of the supernatural way in which God’s Word works. 2. To say that “all we are asked to do is sow the Seed” also suggests a view of the Word which understands preaching the Word chiefly as a matter of communicating propositional truth to the intellect. Both views are inadequate because they are incomplete.

Both will also tend to leave God’s saints inadequately equipped for their ministry. I’m convinced that both ideas are in part responsible for the poor statistics we cited in our introductory comments.

Preaching Means...

To analyze and defend those two observations, we need to make clear what we understand preaching the Word to mean. Preaching as it is ordinarily understood is what preachers do from a pulpit. The meaning that word has in the New Testament is, of course, much broader than that. It means to make known by a herald, to announce, then, to speak about, to mention publicly. Arndt-Gingrich says it is “the proclamation of the Christian message in the widest sense.” The formality people tend to associate with that word today by connecting it with preachers and pulpits is not essential to its meaning. Basically it means to provide information to others by means of words.

The Word Is...

The object of the preaching our Lord directs us to do is the Word. In essence the Word is God’s truths conveyed to us by inspiration in the form of ordinary language. Almost automatically we associate the word “gospel” with the directive to preach. The commission our Lord gave us connects gospel with the imperative to preach. We understand that to mean the gospel in its wider sense. August Pieper reduced the content of the gospel to three irreducible propositions: You have sinned! Your sin is forgiven! Sin no more!

A Concomitant Emphasis on Inspiration

When we instruct persons in the doctrine of the Word in confirmation and instruction classes, we usually put special emphasis on the inspiration of Scripture, on the *impulsus ad scribendum*, the *suggestio rerum*, and the *suggestio verborum*. We follow that up with a study of inspiration’s corollaries: the authority of Scripture,

both its causative (teaching) and its normative (judging) authority; its unique ability to serve as its own interpreter; its inerrancy and infallibility; its sufficiency, and its clarity. Then we conclude with a study of passages appropriate to demonstrate that God's power is inherent to God's Word. "The Word of God is quick and powerful" (Hb 4:12), it is "able to save your souls" (Js 1:21) because it is "the power of God unto salvation" (Rm 1:16). Jesus reminds us that spirit and word are inseparably joined to each other (Jn 6:63), so that if a word is the Word of God, it cannot be destitute of divine virtue and efficacy. It doesn't *become* an instrument with power in an existential encounter with man *a la* Barth, Brunner and their disciples. It is an instrument with divine power to it even apart from its use.

In an age when orthodox teaching regarding the doctrine of the Word is under attack, even by erstwhile evangelicals, we would be renegeing on our responsibility as teachers of the Word if we did not speak out and speak clearly in defense of what God tells us about his Word in his Word. But I wonder if the emphasis we place on this doctrine does not tend to magnify the supernatural way to which the Word works almost to the exclusion of the psychological mode of the operation of God's Word. And if that is the case, does that help to explain why Lutherans, 90% of them, are so hesitant to talk about their faith and about what the gospel means in their daily life? I think so.

The Modes of Operation of the Word – Supernatural

Before I explain that further, let me review with you what we have all learned but may not have remembered about the mode of operation of the Word of God. The word works in both a psychological and a supernatural way. Its supernatural mode of operation is readily understood and easily taught. When I hear God's Word, I *understand* truths I did not know before he revealed them and before he enlightened my mind to know them; I have a *feeling* for God I did not have before he made me feel his love; and I am *determined* to do things I did not want to do before, and to do them to make God's name great rather than my own. The power of God operative in his Word is responsible for that understanding, that feeling and that determination. His "Word is a lamp to my feet and alight for my path." It "makes wise the simple." It enables me to "discern spiritual things."

The Word's psychological mode of operation is just as readily understood and just as easily taught. But it is not as generally understood as is its counterpart. That's either because we do not emphasize it, or because we don't see the importance of its implications.

The Modes of Operation of the Word – Psychological

What is meant by the psychological mode of operation of the Word of God? It means that God's Word has something in common with human speech. God adapted his Word to the human constitution of the creatures he created. In that respect his words are like the words we employ in our associations with each other. Psychologically speaking, we possess intellect, emotions and volition. In ordinary conversation some words serve only to impart information: "Turn left at the next stop light and go two blocks." Some words are intended to stir emotions: "I'm really proud of the way you kept your head when you got in a jam" or "You really look super in that new dress." Some words are directed to the will: "I'm telling you for the last time, sweep the garage today, or else."

God's Word is similar. He created us with the psychological constitution we have. Then when he revealed himself to us to redeem and save us, he chose to do so with words peculiarly adapted to us. He addresses the intellect. He stirs the emotions. He bends the will. He employs words to do that in the same way a lover woos, and a coach inspires, and a teacher informs, and a parent molds the will of a child. Syntax and grammar and figures of speech—he employs them in the same way we do, using the minds and the pens of his holy writers to do so.

Let's take a moment to establish this point from Scripture. First the intellect. "Through thy precepts, I get *understanding*," the psalmist says (119:104). While Jesus was walking with the Emmaus disciples, "he opened their understanding so that they might *understand* the Scriptures" (Lk 24:45). God wants us to "be able

to *comprehend* with all the saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to *know* the love of Christ” (Eph 3:18). Comprehending and knowing are intellectual activities.

God also appeals to our emotions. He stirs them up. Every expression of his love is intended to elicit love. He exhorts us to “rejoice in the Lord always,” he “enlarges my heart,” he “makes my flesh tremble for fear” (Ps 119:120). His Word appeals to the entire gamut of human emotions.

He employs our intellect and our emotions to bend the will. “I *beseech* You therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice” (Rm 12:1). “I *beseech* you...that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye were called” (Eph 4:1).

The Pentecost account serves pointedly to illustrate all three functions. In the sermon Peter preached that day, he simply stated the facts of God’s plan of salvation. People heard and comprehended. That involved the intellect. Some were “pricked in their hearts.” That involved emotion. When they were told to repent and be baptized, their actions indicated that their wills changed from wanting sin to wanting God’s will.

In a seminary dogmatics class discussion of this point several years ago, brother Allen Schroeder observed that certainly God must have intended a different psychological effect with the fireworks and black cloud at Sinai than he intends when he speaks with “a still small voice.”

Implications of the Psychological Mode

There are important implications of the truth that one mode of the operation of God’s Word is psychological. If my preaching and teaching does not contain an appeal to the emotions of my hearers, then I am not handling God’s Word the way he intends for it to be handled. Notice, I said an *appeal* to the emotions. I did not say *play* on the emotions. We *play* on people’s emotions when we are not involved ourselves in what we are saying and doing. Then we are actors, not God’s spokesmen, ham actors as a matter of fact. But if as preacher/teacher we are emotionally involved ourselves in our message we will inevitably affect the emotions of our people. In *Preaching For the Church*, Richard Caemmerer observes, “The human organism operates in a bath of mood and emotion in every waking moment. Every preacher is always emotional. The only question is whether the speaker is going to reflect those emotions which are appropriate to his purpose” (Concordia, 1957, p. 117).

Let me summarize this point by noting that if we understand the psychological mode of the operation of the Word, then our communication of the Word is going to have the quality of a heart-to-heart communication rather than merely the character of a head-to-head communication. People will sense that the Word is alive in us. It has us in its grip. It is our very life. The practical implications of this are worth pursuing, but not now. For anyone interested in pursuing it, I would strongly recommend Helmut Thielicke’s *The Trouble With the Church*. The entire book expounds the proposition that one trouble with the Lutheran Church in his native Germany is that preachers are unconvincing in trying to convince their hearers that they really mean what they are saying. Too much preaching is emotionless in the sense that the delivery does not complement the content. That’s another way of saying, they don’t understand the psychological mode of operation of the Word.

The Need For Balance

Preaching the Word means then that we strive for a balance in the way we handle the two modes of the Word’s operation. If we overemphasize the psychological mode at the expense of the supernatural mode, we end up in the camp of the charismatics. If we overemphasize the supernatural at the expense of the psychological, we are headed in the direction of dead orthodoxy. There are “Lutherans” today in both camps. The statistics in the O’Hara report on Bible class participation, study of the Scriptures, and witnessing suggest we show more symptoms of orthodoxy than we do of neo-Pentecostalism.

My observations lead me to conclude that we tend to overemphasize the supernatural mode rather than the psychological. There are a number of signs which suggest that. When I hear someone say defensively, “All we have to do is preach the Word, the rest is up to the Lord,” I suspect an unwitting overemphasis on the

supernatural mode. When I hear a law-gospel sermon, but I can't distinguish the one from the other in the delivery, I suspect the same thing. How often have you heard someone say in effect, "We can't add anything to the power of the Word, but we can put obstacles in its way." I'm not questioning the validity of that observation. I'm just wondering how many conference papers you have ever heard on those obstacles.

Is there really a cause/effect relationship between an overemphasis on the Word's supernatural mode of operation and a limited outreach on the part of our people? That may seem a bit far-fetched. But I'm convinced there is a causal connection. That overemphasis affects the way a preacher communicates the Word. It gives a certain character to the way he preaches the Word. Too little consideration is given to the hearer's emotion. It is no secret that in our circles we tend to be critical of emotional appeal, especially from the pulpit. It gives us visions of the Zwickau prophets at worst, or of a Francke/Spener brand of pietism at best. Ten years of teaching homiletics has convinced me that the majority of students arrive on campus at Mequon with a bias against displays of emotion when handling God's Word.

That attitude in the pulpit translates into apathy in the pew. Apathetic Christians are quite content to let evangelism efforts up to the pastor and the evangelism committee. If statistics are telling us that we are having a problem motivating our people to follow the lead of the Jerusalem Christians who "went everywhere preaching the Word," then we ought to be asking ourselves some hard questions about the people whose task it is to provide the motivating Word. What kinds of obstacles are we putting in the path of that motivating power on its way to the hearts of our hearers?

Way back in 1943, Richard Caemmerer contributed an article to the *Lutheran Witness* entitled "A Wonderful and a Horrible Thing." He said, "The prophet who speaks the good word so that it dies in the hearer's heart and mind is worth no more than the prophet who prophecies falsely." He further noted, "It is false doctrine to describe the content of the Gospel falsely; it is faulty teaching and hence equally false to lead men who have the pure Gospel to be sluggish and apathetic toward the needs of sinful men."

Ergo...

For the most part we are products of a church in which an imbalance exists with regard to our understanding of the modes of operation of the Word of God. That imbalance is a feature of our ecclesiastical experience. It has conditioned us. It tends to have a limiting effect on our perception of the meaning of our Lord's command to "preach the Word." Unless and until we recognize that and make the necessary adjustments in our preaching, teaching and ministering, I suspect the "profile on Lutherans" is not going to change appreciably.

Two

To say that "all we are asked to do is sow the Seed" also suggests a view of the Word which understands preaching the Word chiefly as a matter of communicating propositional truth to the intellect.

Overemphasis on the Word's supernatural mode of operation has a corollary. It results in preaching and teaching which aim primarily at the intellect. It sees the pastor's task especially in terms of an information processor. It tends to obscure the fact that God gives a pastor to be a trainer who equips God's people for a life of ministry. Or it assumes that if a person is taught the facts of life, he will consequently live a life of Christian ministry. But that notion is Platonic, not Pauline. It was Plato who suggested that if a man *knows* what is right, he will *do* what is right. We adapted the educational philosophy of our public schools to that idea at the beginning of this century. Anyone who thinks it's a valid proposition must have had his head in the sand in the 1960's. Substituting *truth* for *right* in Plato's aphorism does not help to make it any more viable.

To avoid any misunderstanding, let me state unequivocally that teaching Biblical truth does involve the intellect. Jesus makes that clear. He said, "This is life eternal, that they might *know* thee, the one true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (Jn 17:3). The scriptures were written "that believing, we might have life through his (Jesus) name." Christian belief is not contentless. Faith is trust, not blind trust, but trust in what we

know to be true because God's Spirit has enlightened our minds. He gives us "the light of the *knowledge* of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus" (2 Cor 4:6).

To counteract a predilection for cognitive results, we need to ask who or what is sitting in the pew on Sunday and at the desk in catechism and instruction *classes* (n.b.). Not merely brains, not merely intellects operating in a vacuum. They are persons with a personality. Take a moment and give some content to that word "personality." What does it include? Without attempting to be exhaustive, we could list: beliefs, behavior, attitude, motives, relationships, self-concept, emotions, faith. There are others. It is appropriate to focus on three aspects: beliefs, emotions, behavior (which relates to the will). Everyone who sits before us is a complex of these things, persons who live in a real world of problems, persons whose "flesh lusts against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh." We direct our words, God's Word, to them, to the *whole* person.

A person has not "mastered" (a neat word, spell it with a capital) the truth when he can define the omni's of the First Article. Those words remain nothing more than sterile, stale food for the intellect without any noticeable effect upon the hearer unless and until he begins to employ the concepts they express in an attitude of trust and hope, yes and also joy.

Let's take an example. In Gn 17:1 God appeared to Abraham to teach him something. He announced with solemn majesty, "I am the Almighty God," *El Shaddai*. Now that's as dogmatic a proposition as you can find in Scripture, spoken by none other than God himself. It conveys information. It is aimed at the intellect. But it does not stand there alone. It wasn't a proposition to be stored in Abraham's memory cells for recall on demand. EL Shaddai immediately followed up that *revelation* addressed to the intellect with a *directive* addressed to the will: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect." Do it all the time. When you get up in the morning, when you go about the routine matters of life, when you fantasize, when you contemplate your objectives and your goals, when you transact business, when you deal with people, when you relax, when you love your wife, when you take time for your children and when you discipline them, remember "I am the Almighty God." And that *means* practically for you, "Be thou perfect." Without any exception, that truth *affects* every moment, every relationship, every activity of our lives.

When we are preaching and teaching, discipling God's people, we must always keep in mind that God's Word never presents God's truths to only part of man, never to some depersonalized thing in some unreal, antiseptically clean vacuum. God intends His Word to produce affective as well as cognitive results. To achieve what He intends, His Word must be communicated in a way that is consistent with that purpose. It must communicate to the intellect, the emotions and the will, instructing, comforting, exhorting, admonishing, consoling, and giving hope. Much could be said about the how of such communication. But that is not the purpose of this paper.

To forget this whole-man thrust means to become a dogmatist. Dogmatism is to address the intellect as though man lives in a vacuum and needs particularly to get the facts straight so that he can intelligently subscribe to orthodox teaching. Certainly if any group of Christians has ever been warned about the dangers of dogmatism, we have. But an oft repeated warning can begin to have about the same effect on us as a mother's warning to her six-year old on the way out the door to school, "Be careful when you cross the street."

Someone has said that dogmatics is a post-graduate course in catechism. (I prefer to think of it as systematized exegesis.) Some of our fathers were fond of the phrase "*verdamnte Dogmatik*" (I wonder how many times I heard that expression, jovially spoken, in the last 10 years from one of my colleagues in the N.T. department.). If dogmatics is a necessary evil, where does the evil enter the picture? Surely not in the presentation of God's truths arranged in sequential and systematic form. Surely not in the *substance* of the truths. The problem is in the *method* of teaching them. When those truths are presented chiefly, or even almost exclusively, to the intellect rather than to the whole person, there will be unhappy consequences in the church.

Whether we *heed* that to the extent that we *say* that is a matter of subjective judgment. I think we show signs of being thin-skinned when people point a finger at us and suggest that we display signs of a dogmatic approach to our calling. Perhaps we aren't dogmatic. But if we aren't, then we need to come up with an alternative cause or causes for the symptoms which "Profiles on Lutherans" is bringing to our attention.

I am proposing that we are conditioned to overemphasize the intellect in our handling of the Word, and that that overemphasis is a cause of symptoms we have noted. I came out of the Seminary (not last summer) with an inadequate understanding of what the Lord had called me to do. I candidly acknowledge that I entered catechism and instruction classes with the understanding that I was there chiefly as an information processor. My objective was to line up my students thinking about truth with my comprehension of it. I tended to forget that Jesus did not just say, "I am the Truth." He said, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." He didn't say, "The words that I speak unto thee, they are correct propositional truths." He said, "they are spirit and life." I felt satisfied that I had achieved my objective if in an examination service my confirmands demonstrated a good capability to respond correctly to the unrehearsed questions I addressed to them for an hour or more.

Where did I get that notion? I didn't sleep in education courses. In fact, for a paper on this subject I prepared for the Lake District Teachers' Conference, I reread my hand-written Seminary notes, and there it was, clear as could be—in theory. But theory and practice did not jibe. I suspect I began to teach the way I was taught in catechism class, at prep school, at NWC, at the Sem. I was conditioned by the environment out of which I had come.

In addition to that, I have had the opportunity to read student sermons for a decade, and to hear them. I purposely added "to hear them" because hearing often reveals as much or more than reading does. I wonder how often I wrote on student sermons, "The dominant tone of this sermon is a dogmatic one." Or, "the *facts* of life are presented here; what do you have to say about *life*?"

Furthermore I am of the opinion that an objective analysis of the primary thrust of *The Northwestern Lutheran* would reveal that the content aims especially at the intellect. In a periodical which intends to be a voice in support of confessional Lutheranism that may be intentional and justifiable. But the question remains: What are the side-effects of that? Does that help to shape us into the profile which last year's survey revealed?

Perhaps also our use of "classes" as a word to identify our educational programs is indicative of what we are emphasizing—Bible classes, catechism classes, adult instruction classes. The word tends to reinforce the idea that *what* to believe is primary and *how* to live a life of faith is secondary. Religious information course is not much of an improvement.

It might be revealing to test yourself on this point. Review a sampling of your sermons with a view toward determining the ratio between material that answers the question, "What does this text *say* to God's people?" and material which answers the question, "What does this text want to *do* for God's people?"

Before we conclude, I would like to anticipate one possible question someone may raise with regard to the point this paper seeks to advocate, and to respond to it here. The question is this: Doesn't the factor of the human element which plays into both points we have made contradict what Paul says about himself in both letters to the Corinthians? In 1 Cor 2:1-4 Paul says,

When I came to you, brothers, I did not come with eloquence or superior wisdom as I proclaimed to you the testimony about God. For I resolved to know nothing while I was with you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. I came to you in weakness and fear, and with much trembling. My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power, so that your faith might not rest on men's wisdom, but on God's power.

And in 2 Cor 1:12 Paul says, "Now this is our boast: Our conscience testifies that we have conducted ourselves in the world, and especially in our relations with you, to the holiness and sincerity that are from God. We have done so not according to worldly wisdom, but according to God's grace."

In response I would say, when we urge the effecting of an appropriate balance between the supernatural and the psychological modes of the operation of God's Word, that has nothing to do with the employment of "wise and persuasive" words in place of "a demonstration of the Spirit's power." Note the contrast Paul himself employs in 2 Cor 1:12, He contrasts "worldly wisdom" (a la Dale Carnegie, perhaps) with "holiness and sincerity that are from God." Sincerity like love is something you sense in another person. Protestations of it are

unconvincing. It has been said, “Love professed is easily turned aside. Love demonstrated is irresistible.” Sincerity is like that too. A godly sincerity coupled with manifest excitement at the opportunity to share God’s Word with God’s people will go a long way toward helping to achieve the kind of balance we are envisioning.

And that, we think, will also make a necessary contribution toward helping more of our people to reach out willingly, even spontaneously, to their unchurched neighbors. It may also help to diminish the number of times we hear people say, defensively, “All God asks us to do is preach the Word. The rest is up to him.”

Habits which are fixed over a long period of time are not easily changed. Even the desire to change them does not always result in the desired change. But that does not dishearten us. We believe in a God who works in us both to will and to do his good pleasure.

Appendix A.

TABLE XV: EVANGELISM; ATTITUDES, WITNESSING

B. “In the past year how many times would you say that you gave made a personal witness of your faith to:

	<u>11 or More</u>	<u>4 – 10</u>	<u>1 – 3</u>	<u>None</u>
Family	21.4	28.3	33.3	11.4
Friends	13.2	23.2	41.7	15.3
Acquaintances	5.8	14.8	37.6	33.0
Strangers	5.0	5.9	27.8	52.3

Finally, when asked about the degree to which they would participate in a confrontation-style evangelism program, about half indicated they would probably not participate, or would not actively take part. Another 3 in 10 would participate actively as long as they did not have to lead the conversation.

C. “Evangelism often involves approaching strangers and discussing faith with them. In what manner would you be willing to participate in this kind of evangelism if asked by your congregation?”

	<u>% of LC-MS Lay Members</u>
Honestly, I do not think I would participate...	44.8
I would go, but only if I did not have to talk...	7.7
I would go and talk if someone else led the conversation...	31.7
I would go on my own...	9.4
I would lead a team...	4.4

VII. Parish Education Attitudes

The recent growth of pre-schools and enrollment increases in LCMS elementary and secondary schools prompted the inclusion of three items related to child care for pre-school age children and attitudes toward Lutheran parochial schools.

Reflecting child-care trends in the general population, only a minority (28%) of LCMS parents rely on formal agencies for the care of their pre-school children (children under 6 years of age). Most families arrange for baby sitters or care for the children themselves. Since the results shown here are for the total sample, the use of formal agencies may be higher among those with working wives, but Census

Bureau data on pre-school enrollment among 3 – 6 year olds suggests that even among such families, a majority rely on informal child care arrangements. There is a possibility that the 1980's will see some increase in the demand for pre-school child care agencies, as fewer women remain out of the labor force.

Appendix B.

Evaluation and Discussion Questions

1. Mention some factors in our experience and training which tend to influence us to overemphasize the supernatural mode of operation of God's Word?
2. Mention some factors in our experience and training which influence us to perceive our objective as teachers especially in terms of cognitive results.
3. What *preaching* habits or practices can you cite which suggest an overemphasis on the supernatural mode of operation of God's Word?
4. What *pastoral* practices can you cite which suggest an overemphasis on the supernatural mode of operation of God's Word?
5. What *preaching* habits or practices can you cite which suggest cognitive results as a primary objective?
6. What *pastoral* practices can you cite which suggest cognitive results as a primary objective?
7. If and where changes are called for, what are some practical things you can do to implement them?
8. Other factors in addition to those treated in this paper are also responsible for the reluctance of Lutherans to reach out to the unchurched with the gospel. What are some of them? Rank them in the order of their importance.
9. Indicate where in the rank you would include the two factors treated in this paper.
10. Since 10 is the metric number as well as the number of the commandments, what further question can you add to this list to make it complete?