

Here's an interesting question?/. Is it a sign of lack of faith when a Christian goes to the doctor. Shouldn't he trust God to heal him? Let me say three things about this question. First, I do believe that God can heal today. Sometimes He chooses to do so, and sometimes He allows His people to be sick and to suffer and to die. But He can heal and sometimes does. Second, I do not believe ~~that~~ in healers. If healers can heal, let them go to our hospitals and empty them. And let them not use as an excuse that they cannot heal people who do not have faith. Christ healed those who did not believe He could heal them. So let the modern healer do the same. Every healer is ultimately a failure because he cannot heal that final, fatal sickness, and his patients die. Third, God often uses natural means to accomplish His purposes, and He uses medicine and physicians to heal us. God has given them their wisdom whether they recognize it or not, and the Christian should use medical science and thank God and the doctor for it. Would you consider it ~~lack~~ ^{a great show of} of faith to plant a crop and then never cultivate it, water it, prune it, take care of it, just trust God to bring the harvest. You wouldn't get a good harvest that way. You recognize that fruitful seasons and rain come from God, but you also do all you can, even irrigation for example, to assure that the seed will bear a good crop. That's not lack of faith. Likewise, when you are sick you use the medical help that God has given. That's not lack of faith, that's simply good stewardship, good use of what God has given you.

Is there anything wrong with rock music? Of course, musical notes by themselves are neither moral or immoral. Middle C, for example, is neither good or bad in itself. It's a thing and it is without morality.

Well, then, are you saying that rock music can't be bad? Not, not at all. Music is more than notes. It's the arrangement of notes in certain tonal and rhythmic patterns, and rock music is a very special kind of arrangement.

What are the characteristics of rock music that distinguish it from other kinds of music. There are two, I think. One is the rhythm--its incessant and unchanging beat which is calculated to rouse the ^{base} emotions of the hearer. Rhythm can arouse good emotions, like the rhythm of a love song, for example. But rock rhythm is designed to arouse immoral emotions. The second characteristic is rock music is that ~~it~~ having aroused you it just ends and leaves you frustrated. A rock piece does not resolve into a satisfying ending; it just stops. Perhaps you think I am being prejudiced, so let me read something ~~with~~ which was written by a songwriter and a newspaperman and which appeared in a secular magazine. This man said: "I believe that rock music has given young people a virulent fever. Whereas jazz flows along with an exciting but ultimately satisfying and releasing 12/8 time feeling, rock music just stays there, its beat jumping up and down in the same place and producing in the end only the pent-up energy of frustration. Pour that stuff into the ears of an entire generation of young people, make it almost impossible for them to hear anything else, alienate them from their parents with lyrics leading them to the distrust of anyone over thirty, and I would say you've invested a sure-fire formula for trouble." And I think he's right/