

A call for humble wisdom: We can't know whether or not there should be a nuclear war. We can't even know what actions/inactions will make nuclear war more/less probable.

1. I assume (1) that the biblical God is sovereign (2) successfully, i.e., without yielding sovereignty to any creature or combination of creatures. It follows that challenges to the divine sovereignty are frustrated "by whatever means necessary," on an ascending scale from the least violent (as God is "kind") to the most violent (as God is "severe"--Ro.11.22; Gk. meaning "off-cutting"). Sequential inference: I am invited to backread to the sovereignty of God all observed instances of kindness and severity. Impossible? Of course, "for "who has known the mind of the Lord"? But the invitation remains as a call to devotion (my soul set to worship God), obedience (my life set to honor God), and wisdom (my mind set to sense-make to and from God). I am ever set for dialog with alternative paradigms, all of which I consider inferior: my hermeneutic task by revelation and reason.

2. Is this God sovereign but not good (seeing that good is not winner over evil), or good but not sovereign (seeing that, while life wins some battles, death wins the war)? None of your business, says God to Job: hold to my sovereignty, and make whatever sense you can of life within the sphere of my sovereignty: I am King even above the fact that I am Judge. What occasioned this thinksheet is my notice that a theologian recently translated Prophet/Priest/King as Prophet/Priest/Liberator, a rendition pre-Jobean--as though God's power were being exercised primarily under direction of God's goodness narrowed down to being good news to "the oppressed," those whose lives are constricted by human evil (including ignorance) in addition to the limits of "nature." Now, liberationism as a historical program seeks the sanction of the notion of liberation as a cosmic process: all "movements" have thought-engineers (prophets, theologians, philosophers) connecting movement goals to metaphysical (ontological and cosmological) energies. But, biblically, God needs to be liberated from captivity to this rhetoric, else we are not free to deal with history as fact as well as hope.

3. What's happened, now, to the primitive fear of profanation, of wittingly or unwittingly violating sacred place/time/relation/person/idea? In a word, what's become of tabus, the sacred limits guarded by the lions of fear? Biblical religion denuminized nature, then modernity denuminized God (no longer to be feared, maybe even dead). Primordial fear, however, doesn't die; it moves inward (psychoses of the person) and outward (psychoses of history, as in the current nuke/antinuke debate). It's pathetic to see Jewish and Christian clergy letting secularists set the psychoses-agenda, defining for us what is to be feared, controlling (in the public schools and in the media) the fear-indoctrination of our children (who are no longer anywhere being taught to fear God, even in church).

4. What becomes of human sovereignty-claims? Gn.3 & 11, for starters. Ac.2 is sometimes said to reverse Gn.11, but it does so only by restoring unity to those who continue to speak many languages--the unity of the sovereignty of the Spirit (perhaps the dominant theme of L.-Ac.). Limited sovereignty over nature is assigned humanity (Gn. 1f), which implies limited sovereignty by humanity over humanity. By 1865, S.Carolina's claim of sovereignty had been crushed--as by 1755, Scotland's claim of sovereignty had been crushed. What can crush the claims of national sovereignty? Only, it seems to me, (a) the inbreaking Kingdom of God or (b) a military cataclysm of sufficient size, which a nuclear war might be. Nukeniks are against nuke war as peaceniks are against all war; misdirected energy, seems to me.