1968

# Studies in Situation Ethics

Charles Allen Hampton
*Ouachita Baptist University*

# STUDIES IN SITUATION ETHICS

---

An Honors Paper

Presented to

Dr. James Berryman

Ouachita Baptist University

---

In Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Special Studies

Philosophy H 290

---

by

Charles Allen Hampton

May, 1968

General Evaluation:

This study is a very fine survey of the situational approach to Christian ethics. This study has all the weaknesses of a survey.

Specific Criticisms:

Outline--"Bultmann" misspelled.
p. 1, line 10-"my" should be eliminated as well as all personal pronouns (1st and 2nd person) in formal writing.
p. 1, line 13-"I think"-same as line 10
p. 1, line 14-Better style--"The generalization is best illustrated, or can be illustrated by relating..."
p. 1, line 15--Better style--"Some ministerial students..."
p. 2, line 1--"talked with the writer."
p. 2, line 1--"my"--same as p. 1, line 10
p. 2, line3--"The writer" instead of "I"--same criticism for the whole paragraph
p. 2, line 15--"This study" instead of "my"
p. 2, line 16--"myself" omit.
These criticisms apply to the whole paper.
p. 4, line 1--Omit""there are" and "that."
p. 4, line 2--Better style--"A rule is given..."
p. 4, line 12--"Protestant" caps.
p. 7, line 14--colon instead of semi-colon
p. 7, footnote-9--op. cit. should be underlined
p. 7, " 10--Isn't this book a commentary on Bultmann's ethic rather than a book by Bultmann?
p. 9, line 23--Why the apostrophe?
p. 10, line 14--"pregnant" is a better word.
p. 15, footnote 23--see comment on p. 7, footnote 10.
p. 19, " 35--Ibid., should be underlined.

Overall Grade: A

Jim Bergman
Evaluator

OUTLINE

I. Introduction

II. Definition of Situationism
   A. Legalism--extreme laws
   B. Antinomianism--no laws
   C. Situationism--interest of "love"

III. History of Situationism
   A. Pragmatism--something is good if it works
   B. Relativism--everything is contextual
   C. Positivism--voluntary affirmation in faith
   D. Humanism--people are the center of concern

IV. Approaches to Situationism
   A. Bultman--"love as thyself"
   B. Robinson--"nothing prescribed but love"
   C. Fletcher--"only agapeic love"

V. Pros and cons of Situationism

VI. Personal evaluation of Situationism

# INTRODUCTION

"The New Morality is Here!" proclaimed a news magazine several years ago, and with such an announcement came acceptance, rejection, opinions, reactions, controversy, and great debates. Since the announcement, theologians, pastors, philosophers, educators, and even common men have had much to say about "Situationsethik." Unfortunately, many of the opinions offered are those of uninformed closed-minded individuals who give a negative review of situational ethics. One commentator said that the new morality will "offend some, excite many, and challenge all!"[1] From my general observation, the new morality seems to excite and challenge the informed persons while offending the uninformed. This last statement is a very broad generalization, but I think the observation is true in many cases.

I think I can illustrate the generalization by relating an event of a few weeks back when some of my fellow ministerial

---

[1]John C. Bennett, "Ethical Principles and Context," Year Book 1960-1961 (Evanston, Illinois: American Society of Christian Ethics, Report of Second Annual Meeting, 1961) p. 10.

students talked to me. For some reason, five of my fellow students formed a self-appointed committee to point out where I was going astray. These students had discovered I was studying situation ethics and came to correct my mistake. I very quietly and patiently listened to them (a very difficult task for someone of my temperament). After they presented their case, I asked if they had read the book entitled Situation Ethics; The New Morality. The answer to my question was a negative reply for only one had even started reading the book. Not one out of the five students could tell me the author's name (Joseph Fletcher). I suggested that the students read the book in order to find out why they were against it. I also flatly told them I would not discuss situation ethics until they were informed about the subject.

The purpose of my study has been and is to inform myself about the new morality. Having such information, maybe I can avoid the negative uninformed attitude of my fellow students. This paper is a summary of my findings with some of my observations included. I hope this writing will be informative to others while stimulating them to study situation ethics open-mindedly. Such an open-minded study will lead to a great appreciation for the values presented by modern ethics writers. Thus, I hope the reader will very thoughtfully explore this vital subject with me in the next few pages.

## STUDIES IN SITUATION ETHICS

As one begins a study of "situation ethics" or "the new morality," perhaps confusion arises because of the many concepts making up the contextual elements of the new morality. What is situation ethics? Basically, the situationists agree that each situation must be judged according to agapeic love. The situationist seeks to weigh all the circumstances of a given situation and make decisions in the way that best exemplifies love and not law.[2] Contrary to general opinion, situationism does not completely throw all law away; however, law is not the all important factor in moral judgment and decisions. A quick comparison of the law (legalism), no law (antinomianism), and love (situationism) reveals that situation ethics is the golden mean between two extremes.[3]

Legalism is the insistence on a strict literal or overt observance of certain rules of conduct, or simply the

---

[2]Henlee H. Barnette, The New Theology and Morality (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968) p. 32.

[3]Ibid., p. 39.

belief that there are certain rules that must be obeyed.[4] For every situation there is a rule given and all the legalist has to do is look up the rule. The laws are absolute and as such form the basic first principles of all moral life. Regardless of the ends, the means (absolute law) remains supreme and can not be broken by the legalist.

Traditionally, the Christian ethic is just such a legalistic moral code. Catholicism looks to nature as its guide in all moral, spiritual, rational, and social problems.[5] The Catholic looks to the reason of natural law as the rule book of life. Protestants have likewise developed an extreme legal system; however, the protestant uses his scriptures to give himself a law book.[6] Traditional Christianity does not even accept the fact that Christ filled the law full of meaning, for the Christian church seeks to set up a legal system just as the established religion of Jesus's day did. How pious we are to criticize the Pharisees, and yet develop a system just like the one being torn to shreds!

An interesting fact about legalism is that the law almost always brings the downfall of its advocate--namely

---

[4]Dagobert D. Runes (ed.), Dictionary of Philosophy (Patterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, & Co., 1964) p. 166.

[5]Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics: The New Morality (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 21.

[6]Ibid.

the legalist. Every author, book, article etc. consulted in this study has given the same general conclusion: the law does not become a part of the legalist. Therefore when faced with a moral decision, the legalist has nothing which is solidly his--that is he has no inbred principles or basis for making a decision. Thus faced with a decision, the legalist away from his legal code fails in his moral obligation.

Very often situationism is confused with a second approach to ethics; this approach is antinomianism. Literally, the term antinomianism means a system of complete lawlessness. The individual is free to do as he pleases whenever he wants to simply because he is free of all laws. Some Renaissance and Reformation theologians rebelled completely against the legalistic Christianity by applying Christian grace to the ultimate. Grace and freedom were equated, and because Christ came giving grace, the individual is totally free from any moral system, code, law, etc.[7]

Antinomianism has found many forms since its original birth, and although different reasons for total freedom are given, all forms give total freedom to the individual.

---

[7]Rudolf Bultmann, Essays: Philosophical and Theological (London: S. C. M. Press, 1955) p. 32.

Libertinism states that because of "grace, by the new life in Christ and salvation by faith, laws and rules no longer apply." The Gnostics claim they have a super-conscience with which to make decisions, and thus no law is needed. Others claimed to be spirit-filled (Holy Spirit), and made decisions according to the guidance of the spirit. Still others took the route of the intuitionist by saying they possessed a radar network which "told" them when a situation was right or wrong.[8] Yet all of these approaches to ethics fail in giving freedom.

First, an antinomian approach is impossible. People can not live together in a totally disordered community for to do so brings the downfall of any society. To think of living in a world where everyone did what he wanted to do when he wanted would be absurd, and the world would be utter chaos. Second, antinomianism not only gives freedom from law but also freedom from the consequences of one's actions. Such a system as this was never advocated by Christ nor by a God who speaks of a judgment day for all people. Someday we will be held accountable for our actions, and thus Jesus did not give freedom to do as we please but freedom to choose.

---

[8]Fletcher, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

Someday our choices will be judged. We are not totally free from obligation, for we must give account of our actions.[9]

Situationism is the middle ground between the extremes of legalism and antinomianism. The situationist seeks to present the ideal moral system by correcting the errors found in the "law" and the "total free" concepts. The situationist gathers general concepts (not laws), and yet is not bound so rigidly to his concepts that freedom is squelched. Based upon his concepts with love as his guide, the situationist looks at the decision to be made, the possible consequences, and all relevant factors. In light of the above considerations, the situationist makes his moral decisions. The theologian Bultmann presented his definition as follows;

> What does the movement demand? It does not demand a what but a that. It demands, in every conceivable situation that we love. But the content (the specific "what") of this love must be left to the existing individual in his concrete situation.[10]

Joseph Fletcher defined situationism when he said;

> The situationist enters every decision-making situation fully armed with the ethical maxims of his community and its heritage, and

---

[9]Bultmann, op. cit., p. 32.

[10]Rudolf Bultmann, Radical Obedience, trans. Thomas C. Oden (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 35.

> he treats them with respect as illuminators of his problems. Just the same he is prepared to compromise them or set them aside in the situation if love seems better served by doing so.[11]

By making love the all important factor, the situationist is not bound to a strict legal book or code like the legalist. The situationist takes on the love of God as his guiding principle, and has the obligation of applying agape love in the situations of life. Because of the application obligation, the situationist is thus not totally free of all responsibility like the antinomian. In making decisions, the situationist tries to see how he can best take the love of his vertical relationship with God and apply this love in the horizontal relationship with his fellow man. In short situationism is the mean between the extremes.

An illustration of the three systems just discussed is found in the manner that three pastors raised their children. No clearer example could be given for the first pastor was a legalist, the second an antinomian, and the third a situationist. Each pastor raised his child according to his belief, and the results are quite interesting.

The first child was raised in terms of the legalistic philosophy. She was told not to go to movies, not to smoke, not to drink, not to dance, not to pet while

---

[11]Fletcher, op. cit., p. 26.

dating etc. On the positive side, she was told to be honest, say her prayers, go to church, read the Bible constantly etc. From this one small list, one can see that this girl's moral life consisted of a catalog of do's and dont's. The time came for the daughter to go away to college where decisions would be made by herself. Very religiously she sought to maintain the code she had been taught. The result was that she had been given a code of her parents which really didn't have the self-principles she needed. The code told her what to do and what not to do, but she had no idea why she did or didn't do something. She had no personal basis for her actions and when faced with a decision, she failed. One night she had sexual intercourse with a boy, and since she couldn't live up to the law, she completely rebelled against the regulations. The end result was a cutting of her love relationship with God and man. Legalism brings the downfall of its advocate.

The second pastor raised his child by letting his son do as he pleased. "My son needs to be perfectly free to find himself. I let him do what he wants so he can find himself," the father said. The result of this antinomian raising is a fellow who knows only himself for he is still gratifying his needs. Others' individual needs mean nothing to him. As long as the son can have money from father,

he is happy for then he can fulfill his needs. Regardless of others, everything is great when the son has his wants fulfilled. Such conduct is not the teaching of a Christ who said "Love God and love others." Antinomianism relieves the person of all obligation!

The situationist-raised son was taught certain principles centered around God's love. He was given a foundation and guidance encouraging him to make his own decisions on the basis of his personal principles. The son has developed such a moral concept based upon love. One of the most outstanding characteristics of this boy as well as his family is their care for others. The son even went so far as taking a stand for abortion because he felt love would be best served. A girl had been raped and was expecting as a result. The girl knew that her father would insist on marriage even though she had been raped. The father thought that any girl could keep a fellow from raping her if she really wanted to do so. The child would grow up unloved, and so the pastor's son stood for abortion in this case. Incidentally, the son is now a social worker in a large city where he is showing God's love to thousands. Situationism is based upon love!

Once the meaning of situation ethics is understood, one can not help but wonder where such a system was developed.

Dr. John A. T. Robinson, Bishop of Woolwich, England, is generally accredited with the formation of situation thought;[12] however, four philosophical trends give rise to the "new morality." These trends are a part of the Western life and form the basis of Christian love concepts.

As the population of the New World began to push westward during the seventeenth century through the eighteenth centuries, a new measure was set up for the individual. No longer were the classical values important in a wilderness that must be conquered. Whether a man could talk of classical philosophy, theorize about man's rights, or even read and write was of little significance in a world of forest to be cleared, homes to be built, animals to be conquered, and Indians to be fought. A man was measured by how many logs he could split in a day, how much land he could clear in a week, etc. Out of such a world came the basic American philosophy of pragmatism which is one basis for situationism. Pragmatism states that something is good if it works. With the industrial revolution, pragmatism was in full force, for the man of industry was measured by the amount of goods he could produce.[13] Christianity

---

[12]John A. T. Robinson, Christian Morals Today (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 8-11.

[13]Bultmann, Essays, Philosophical and Theological, pp. 312-313.

takes the pragmatic philosophy one more step and states something is good if it works for agapeic love.[14] Within the given framework of an event, the situationist tries to find the way that will best portray God's love. Such a view classes the situationist as a pragmatist.

Development of natural science and technology leads man to see his world in terms of the mathematical or physical laws resulting in a repudiation of any world which can't be seen. Man begins to order his world himself thus producing a world relative to his culture.[15] With the advent of the scientific world came relativism of a scientific nature. Man's ethics knowledge etc. became relative to the scientific minds and culture which formed them. Classical relativism maintains that there are no binding ethics or natural law.[16] The relativism of science plus classical relativism forms one of the pillars of situational thought. Within the framework of the circumstances, the situationist decides what to do, and therefore his actions are relative to his surroundings. Events are not judged by some pre-set unbreakable rules, but by the best interest of the related situational circumstances.

---

[14]Fletcher, op. cit., p. 42.

[15]Bultmann, Essays: Philosophical and Theological, pp. 312-313.

[16]Ibid.

The third foundation of situationism is positivism which originated with Auguste Comte. According to Comte, the highest form of knowledge is the simple description of sensory phenomena. The positive doctrine was based upon three stages which were the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. Within the theological, human wills were used to explain natural events. In the metaphysical, the wills were not personal but became forces and essences.[17] The positive found true knowledge in terms of the senses rather than nature revealed unto man through his mind. When positivism is applied to law, the term means the laws that are actually valid in a given country at a given time.[18] Positive theology has as its basis the voluntary affirming of faith because of positive revelation and not negative conclusions of rationalistic speculations.[19] "Thinking is supported by faith rather than faith being supported by reason."[20] The Christian situationist puts his faith in God, receives God's love within his soul, and then uses reason to apply love in any given situation. Thus situationism is based upon positive theology or positivism.

---

[17]Runes, op. cit. p. 243.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Fletcher, op. cit. p. 47-48.

The last major trend affecting situationism is humanism which has the welfare of persons as the core of its postulates. The humanist or personalist is concerned not with objects or things but with people and their individual needs.[21] In the United States, humanism increased through the industrial revolution and probably reached a climax during the "New Deal" policies of Franklin Roosevelt. Since the depression days countries all over the world have become interested not in the machinery of the world but the people of the world. Situationism is a part of the humanistic movement because the situationists ask who (who is to be helped?) and not what (what does the law say?).[22] Armed with the love of God, the situationist is interested in human need and human situations.

The four theories of pragmatism, relativism, positivism, and humanism have been combined by many situationists to produce various theories of the new morality. Although each situationist has his individual interpretation, all believe that love is the essential element. All of the theories of love are based primarily upon one of three

---

[21]Mark Hopkins, The Law of Love and Love as a Law (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), pp. 189-198.

[22]Fletcher, op. cit. p. 50.

approaches to situationism. Rudolf Bultmann presents one theory, John Robinson has a slightly different interpretation, and Joseph Fletcher begins his ethics where others have stopped. A quick survey of these three men's views will support the above statement.

Rudolf Bultmann is probably one of the earliest advocates of situation ethics, and he simply says that men must love others as themselves. In his approach to the "love as thyself" situation, Bultmann stands on an eschatological ethic which he calls radical obedience. Man is to act by "radical obedience" in love. By "radical obedience," Bultmann means "to listen for and respond to the Word of God speaking through the situation in which one exists."[23] God is breaking into our everyday situations and showing his authority now. The indication of God's authority now shows his final authority in the end of time. The future plans of God for man depend upon what man does in the present situation. Thus, man's future with God and his present life on this earth can not be separated. Man must act in radical obedience of totality like he is at the end of time and has reached ultimate judgment and decision.[24] This radical

---

[23]Thomas C. Oden, Radical Obedience (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964) p. 25.

[24]Barnette, op. cit. p. 33.

obedience is disguised as love. One can not have God as his master unless he has obeyed God's command to love his neighbor. Bultmann asserts that man does not have to have a set of ethics, but is to be radically obedient in the given situation. Although our precedents may give some insight into a given situation, the situation itself will provide what is needed for our actions. On the basis of what is revealed in the situation, man responds to his neighbors as himself through love. Man will know how to respond because he knows how he would expect to be treated if he were in the same circumstances.[25] Man thus realizing what his needs would be in the given situation can respond in love to the needs of others. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" becomes the central theme of Bultmann's "radical obedience."

Robinson goes a step further in stating that love is the only basis for making judgments. He didn't say "love as thyself" but love in every situation. Let pure agapeic love show forth. All laws and moral rules change as do day to day situations, and thus the only thing which remains constant is selfless and sacrificial love. Within the

---

[25]Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus and the Word (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958) p. 115.

situation, people are treated as people with unconditional seriousness.[26] A person's needs in a given situation might be different from another's needs. The highest love would be shown as the person's needs are met because the needs are his individual problems. Loving as thyself is not the highest type of love because another's needs will be different in the identical situation. Love as the only law is shown best as one loves the individual in his particular needs. Robinson sums up his ethics of love when he says;

> Love alone, because, as it were, it has a built-in moral compass, enabling it to home instinctively upon the deepest need of the other, can allow itself to be directed completely by the situation.[27]

Joseph Fletcher approaches every situation with only one norm--"the agape of the commandment to love God and neighbor."[28] If any rule is valid, love is behind that rule. For example, the ten commandments are valid only if they are love oriented. Thus, the situationist does reject certain rules because the rules are not based upon love. Situationism goes from its one law-love, to the general

---

[26]Robinson, Christian Morals Today p. 36-37.

[27]John A. T. Robinson, Honest to God (London: S. C. M. Press, 1963) p. 115.

[28]Barnette, op. cit. p. 39.

principles of the church, and culture to the moment of decision.[29] Fletcher then sets forth six propositions which show support for his love ethics.

First, the only thing which is intrinsically good is love.[30] Since nothing is worth anything in and of itself, then something acquires good or evil qualities according to the circumstances. In seeking to love others, values take on different qualities at certain times so that the person will not be hurt. What might be unimportant to one person might be important to another; however, love would dictate the taking on of the importance in order to keep from offending a person.

Next, love is the ultimate goal of Christianity. The situationist approaches any situation with his views at hand, but sets them aside if conflicting with agapeic love. Even Jesus set aside sabbath observance laws in order to show love in healing a withered hand. Love stands as the ultimate rule.[31]

Third, love and justice are the same. As problems arise, love is given to meet others' needs, provide for them, and give what is rightly theirs. Justice then

---

[29]Fletcher, op. cit. p. 33.

[30]Ibid., p. 57.

[31]Ibid., pp. 69-86.

becomes love working out the problems equally and fairly. Justice thus becomes love distributed.[32]

Next, love is not liking. Although we do not care for a particular person, we should still love him. Love is an attitude of helping fulfill others' needs, and although someone is disliked, his needs must still be met. The love ethic demands caring for needs.[33]

Proposition five states that the end (love) justifies the means. The means are only the roadway to the end and as such are not important. The important element is the end or purpose for the given action (the means).[34]

The last proposition states that "Love's decisions are made situationally and not prescriptively." Within life's experiences, the individual contacts certain gray areas of decision, and in fact all decisions are gray depending upon their circumstances. Thus, an act may be completely wrong in one case and completely right in another case. The decision has to be made by the individual faced with the situation. He will be held accountable for the way he made his decision according to the situation and how love was carried out in the situation.[35]

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 87-102.

[33] Ibid., pp. 103-120.

[34] Ibid., pp. 121-133.

[35] Ibid., pp. 134-145.

Thus, Fletcher presents love as the only element of moral judgment. The Christian should ask, "How can I meet the needs of people through love?"

Men like Bultmann, Robinson, and Fletcher have presented views that have certainly stirred various opinions, because their ideas are unorthodox. Although presenting Christ's views, the situationists have produced views contrary to the traditional, institutionalized church. The reactions have been both pro and con, and an objective review of the pros and cons reveals some value in both positions. The basic arguments for and against situation ethics are presented below.

The most obvious value of situationism is that it works. The new concepts stand fast when tested. Christians who believe in justice, humanism, accountability, and faith can find all these elements in situationism. Rightness or wrongness is determined by love, man's needs are cared for by love, man's obligation to love makes him accountable for his actions, and love starts with faith in God. From the love ethic the best in every situation is served to individuals.

Love as the core of ethics also presents the ideas of Christ.[36] Christ came interested more in the spirit

---

[36]Barnette, op. cit., p. 42.

rather than the letter of the law because he came filling the law full of meaning. Christ came giving a love ethic which makes any law come alive. Through love, the situationist tries to put the spirit of the law first just as Jesus did.

Counselors and pastors especially like the emphasis upon new casuistry. Especially are professional counselors grateful for the emphasis upon people instead of beginning with prefabricated moral laws.[37] People in serious trouble are not really helped when told "Thou shalt not." The situationist avoids "Thou shalt nots" by finding right and wrong in the relation of love to the situation.

Last, authors of the "new morality" have stimulated the common man to examine his own moral convictions. Ethics has become a subject to be examined by all men, and perhaps a better ethical system will evolve as a result of such study. The general public will at least be better informed as a result.[38]

The new morality also has some weaknesses, some of which are not valid. However, a quick summary of these criticisms will perhaps show some inconsistencies in situational thought.

---

[37] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[38] Ibid.

First, the situationist tries to have no rules in making moral decisions, and yet a rule is given--namely that we love in the situation.[39] For example Bultmann presents a "standardless moment," but he can not escape the standard of loving a neighbor as oneself.

Ambiguity also plays a part in the definition of love. Fletcher uses the word love to mean the intrinsic good, justice, principle, disposition, ruling norm, or any other term. One is also not quite sure about what the "right situation" means in terms of love.

Third, the situationists have made love abolish all law. Love is the fulfillment of law but not the destroyer of law. Love is supposed to make law work but not abolish law.[40]

Fletcher in particular has stimulated the next objection. Some critics have said that the situationist seeks to do away with prefabricated rules, and yet for a given situation, Fletcher will render a judgment. Even though he is not in the situation, Fletcher has an answer which some critics brand as prefabricated.

Other critics see the "love alone" idea as being too one-sided. Certainly, the critics maintain, the best

---

[39]Barnett, op. cit., p. 20.

[40]Barnette, op. cit., p. 44.

interest of a situation is not served from the view of "love only." Many views enter into the context, and these views must be considered also.[41]

The last criticism maintains that the situationists are interested in love from the standpoint of utility. Love is served because it works for the given instant and not because God's revelation of purposes is best served. Taking God and his revelation from the situation reduces him to a small being. Making God merely a "love being" in the situation limits Him to the situation and thus makes Him too small.[42]

Thus, the history, concepts, beliefs and opinions of the new morality have been presented. The future trends for the love ethic can only be seen in terms of an educated guess, and just such an educated guess is what I want to present as my personal view. My own personal view is found in Matthew 22:37-39 where Jesus says;

> You must love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the greatest and most important commandment. The second commandment is like it: You must love your neighbor as yourself. (T.E.V.)

In these three verses, Jesus portrays a very mature ethic. The maturity of what Jesus had to say refutes all

---

[41]Barnett, op. cit., p. 5.

[42]Barnette, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

criticism in my opinion. I fail to see how a command to love God can be equated with the smallness of a moral rule or standard, thus the "standardless moment" is genuine. The broadness of agape love includes many aspects, and thus I think there is no ambiguity. The situationist does not abolish law but makes love the essence of all moral action. Situationists have offered solutions which are not prefabricated but which are based upon the total picture of the situation. A person applying love is also applying faith in the author of that love and is thus not one-sided. The situationist also considers all elements concerning the situation which certainly presents a many sided view. Last, faith in God is not a totally utilitarian movement, and the broad concept of love is not the reflection of a small God! The future for situation ethics is found in the fact that love refutes the criticism and is an ethic of maturity. As Christians mature, the law of love will become the all important value. The future will continue in the present trend as more and more Christians grow in the concept of love. However, the mature concept will become a value only if present Christians start now to "LOVE GOD AND LOVE FELLOW MAN."

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Barnett, Das Kelly (ed.). Year Book 1960-1961. Evanston, Illinois: American Society of Christian Ethics, Report of Second Annual Meeting, 1961.

Barnette, Henlee H. The New Theology and Morality. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Essays: Philosophical and Theological. London: S. C. M. Press, 1955.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Jesus and the World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. 2 Vols. Trans. Kendrick Grobel. London: S. C. M. Press, 1959.

Fletcher, Joseph. Situation Ethics; the New Morality. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

Hopkins, Mark. The Law of Love and Love as a Law. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Oden, Thomas C. Radical Obedience. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Robinson, John A. T. Christian Morals Today. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Robinson, John A. T. Honest to God. London: S. C. M. Press, 1963.

Runes, Dagabert D. (ed.). Dictionary of Philosophy. Patterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, and Co., 1964.