What is dialogue? To define it we must subject our thoughts to the master of its definition; Martin Buber.1 Space dictates that only one aspect of this rich stream of thought can be expounded. This key term is 'inclusion': the extension of one's own concreteness 'over there.' The elements of inclusion are relation, common experience, and the fact that this one person without forfeiting his own experience lives through the common event from the standpoint of the other. The subject catches himself 'over there' and feels how it affects the self and how it affects this other human and so does he baptize self will in reality. The extension of this attitude tends to call forth a response of trust and confidence from the one receiving it.

This is not sympathy, for sympathy is a reminiscence called forth by the occasion. This is not empathy, for empathy means the exclusion of one's own concreteness. In empathy, one accepts and understands and takes a role that prevents the assertion of his true and full personality. The empathizer is a closed book to one who is his object, but he who engages in dialogue is not empathizing nor attempting domination, nor seeking satisfaction. He is standing 'over against' the other as full and open personality seeking to sense the 'overagainstness' of the other. He must experience the event from the other side as well as his side. Any relation in which there is this element of inclusion is dialogic. If the inclusion is onesided, one has education; if concrete and mutual, friendship.

True love demands dialogic communication. It demands the recognition of the others as a 'thou,' not an 'it,' that encounter, not to use or absorb. One commits the 'thou' to himself and himself to the 'thou,' recognizing the claims of the other and relating to them. This relationship confirms the other's uniqueness, seeing and accepting the whole being of the other. One in dialogue shares a reality that neither belongs to him nor is merely outside of him.

Now the conservative's failure in dialogue is glaringly indicated by our irrelevance in this modern age. We are irrelevant because we are out of dialogue. We tend to cut ourselves off both from the left and the right. Our tradition of orthodoxy cuts us off from the theological discussion on the left, because they must meet the standards of orthodoxy; our extensive education severs us from the tradition of pietism, because they must meet our standards of sophistication. We have the charismatic feeling that we are now

1. See Buber's Between Men and Man, p. 95 ff. Maurice S. Friedman's Martin Buber, p. 88 ff.
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IMPLICATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE - (an editorial)

Fuller Theological Seminary is an independent seminary. A great part of its distinctiveness lies in the fact that it doesn't belong to the historic denominations. While this independence offers benefits in the control of certain attitudes of faith and in denominational diversity, there are also problematic implications inherent in such independence. These problems find a focus in three areas: authority, worship, and history.

The attempt to achieve independence involves a measure of rebellion against authority. In 1947, the religious scene of the United States was lacking a certain emphasis, so the founders sought a remedy in setting up a seminary. In the course of establishment, several faculty had to sever their connections with the historic denominations. To achieve independent—and we judge, mature—status, they chose to rebel against authority.

Now with this we have no quarrel. But a problem arises when the Seminary expects the student to cooperate with denominations and to submit to certain regulations. It expects the student to submit to control, when the school has within it a tradition of defying authority. It seems to us that the Seminary presents an unclear picture when it demands submission to authority.

The result is that we are presented with an ambiguous figure of authority, one which by its nature forbids clear decisive acceptance or rejection. We cannot figure out our own reaction to authority—and this includes Scripture—when so unclear an example is set. Our position is further complicated by our own personal histories, for many of us have defied our denominations by coming to Fuller. So we already have a confused reaction to authority, and this is only increased at Seminary. We can neither belong nor be free.

There are several possible solutions to this problem of authority. One would be to strengthen the control over the student, but this is contrary to Fuller's tradition of a liberal education. By this is meant that the student is free to investigate, to make decisions, to make mistakes. To make rules in such a context is to cultivate irresponsibility. A second palliative would be to offer sympathy and understanding for the student. A third would be to reduce authority where it is of doubtful help to the student. In this last category, for one example among many, compulsory classes might be abolished.

The second area which presents itself to us is that of worship. Because we come from so many traditions ourselves, it will probably never happen that we will have a form of worship which will be satisfactory to all—the cry will be either 'Baptist barrenness' or 'popish symbolism.' Nor do we have the sacraments to unite us, for we do not commemorate our Lord's death together, and we do not (as far as we know) perform any ritual lustrations. Further, that which should unite us more than anything else, our quarterly 'Day of Prayer,' creates problems for several students who feel a need for greater honesty than they feel a public meeting permits. Thus again, this time in the area of worship, we are presented with an unclear picture.

A possible aid to solving the problem of worship would be the institution of a service of Holy Communion. In this outward sign—upon which we all agree—we can find a greater sense of belonging to one another and to our God. As Augustine said: 'For men cannot be welded together in any name of religion, whether
true or false, unless they are bound in the partnership of signs or visible sacraments." (Against Faustus the Manichaean, xix., 11)

The third area which presents a problem is history—or rather the lack of it and its goals. While the founding professors have an awareness of the total picture, a knowledge of where the Seminary fits into the scheme of the past, we do not. The Seminary itself is in a fascinating state of transition—where a conservative attitude meets with liberal educational standards, there are bound to be interesting explosions and other growing pains. But though the past is clear to some, the future is not. And the achievement of personal goals is made more difficult by a lack of institutional aims.

Probably the greatest manifestation of the problem of history is the conflict into which many seniors fall concerning ecclesiology—which church. Here the Seminary is not yet able to help, as its relationship to denominations is still unclear.

The greatest solvent to the problem of history is history, and lots of it. But because Fuller doesn't have too much, we are just going to have to wait and grow. In the meantime, perhaps those who do have some clear idea of where the seminary should go would make their opinions known (Need we say in the opinion?).

In conclusion, add these three areas together, mix with the American educational system, season with a gadgety-frenetic-mechanistic-selfish society, and what do we get? A directionless and fractured student body. No wonder! This is the great implication of independence—that we are free from ties but not freed to ties.

What are we to do? We have tried to make some concrete suggestions. Far clearer guides are needed in these areas of authority, worship, and history. We are sure that they will come—in time. But meanwhile we wish to make a plea for understanding, that we learn to bear with our collective adolescence, living with both apathy and energy. Finally let us commit ourselves to a ministry of listening and loving, that we may find reflected in one another the person of Jesus Christ, who renders valid and invalid authority, worship, and history. Let us pledge ourselves to honest fellowship, that life may flourish where it now grows and sprout where it is not yet seen.

'O gracious Father, we humbly beseech thee for thy holy Catholic Church, that thou wouldest be pleased to fill it with all truth, in all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it; where it is in error, direct it; where in any thing it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, establish it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite it; for the sake of him who died and rose again, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord. Amen." (The Book of Common Prayer, p. 37.)

--WS
engage in polemic monologue, or to submit our minds to the truth that threads its way through the fabric of their writings? Too often we orthodox relate to other streams of thought polemically, not dialogically. No real cross-fertilization can take place, with the result that our thought becomes inbred and out of touch. A lack of common language destroys communication. It is important then to remember that we cannot force such men to pass muster in our language, but rather we must attempt to appreciate theirs—to step 'over there.' In dialogue we gain what they have to offer. If one opens his mind, shelves his categories, steps 'over there,' only then has he learned. If the other refuses to respond in like manner, it is his loss for not having paid the price asked, i.e., a genuine confidence and respect in the integrity of the other subject and an eagerness to learn from him.

The fault which we fall prey to within the body of Christ is relating through ideas, not persons. Dialogue is not wrangling, for wrangling is a disguised monologue attempting to win over to a position, not to understand and appreciate. We allow labelling symbols to act as a filter in our relation with the other person. We veil what might be a common ground of faith with theological symbols. We must set aside the weapons of labels and enter the world of dialogue if we would know a man and his redemptive relationship to God. In this paper, we are not setting out to judge the correctness of these symbols, but rather to show that in love we should care to see how the other is related to God.

Why do we fail to have dialogue? It is difficult for our prideful and insecure spirits to open the stained glass windows of our symbolic classification to the fresh breath of truth that we, protected in our house of defensiveness and self-sufficiency, have not felt. We fail to have dialogue because we do not recognize the shortcomings of verbal symbols. We equate them with reality, press their meaning and systematize them, and then impose an Hegelian-like structure as that which must be God's truth.

Again, we excuse ourselves from dialogue by saying that opening ourselves to dialogue would be lapsing into relativism. 'We who hold the oracles of God may not trifle with error, only refute it.' But is this not arrogance? We forget that doctrine as well as conduct is a matter of sanctification. Who are we to say that our perspective is wholly in focus, our interpretation papal? We are presupposing that God never stands over against our church: but all sin. Judgment comes even upon judges. Truth ever stands over against us.

The last and most critical reason that we fail to have dialogue is that we fear the insecurity and pain of learning and giving up beliefs. We must have all things sure or we fear to fall into the abyss of relativism. We have a terror of acquiring ideas that do not neatly fit in.

For these reasons, we avoid theological dialogue. The inferences that have been drawn thus far from what Buber has said may tend to make one feel that dialogue is merely the optimal communication of abstracts. But dialogue truly takes place in, with, and beyond the conveyance of content, in the confrontation of subject and subject. Intimacy and openness must come at a level of relationship wherein masks are discarded.

Dialogue is necessary for the Christian. Bonhoeffer clarifies for the Christian the implications of this idea of dialogue by his
definition of the church as the 'fellowship of the confession of guilt.' He repudiates the term fellowship as applied to an aggregate of the pious, for in this none can safely remove his mask. (Life Together, p. 110 ff.) He demands that true fellowship engage a man to a man in humiliating confession of sin so that in open honesty the redeemed sinners can know one another as sinners in the concrete, not in the abstract. Fellowship in the body is found by mutual openness and forgiveness with a brother. Before a brother I can 'dare to be a sinner.'

We as seminary students must learn to listen dialogically, not polemically. In addition to our own personal efforts, the Seminary might help us to recognize the finiteness of our own perspective by inviting men, the peers of our professors, versed in and sympathetic to other streams of thought, to lecture and debate. Also, public discussion between our professors would go far in teaching us dialogic attitudes--the experience of group therapy is helpful.

Unless we learn to listen to others, we will be of no help to our people. Only by respecting a man's intellectual and spiritual integrity and hearing him out can we understand and appreciate what he believes and why; in short, 'step over there.'

2. See also Reuel Howe, Herein is Love.

FROM OUR MUSIC CORRESPONDENT --

As newly appointed music critic for the opinion, it gives me great pleasure at this time to submit my first--and last--contribution to this venerable paper. My theme is: The Student Recital, Fuller Seminary, Thursday, April 19, 1962. Being more accustomed, as I am, to administering oral examinations than to functioning as a music critic, I found myself involuntarily writing down A's, B's and C's as each performing artist walked out the door. The highest mark went to Carter Doran, who during the course of the evening changed everything except his ways. Then there was the fabulous Foulon, who turned out to be a kind of walking symphony orchestra, performing on the flute, the recorder and the violin. Time and space would fail me to give honorable mention to all the other worthy artists who combined their talents to provide a most enjoyable evening. One could wish that a few more interpretive remarks had been made to help the layman. Those that were given were very helpful, especially those by Constance Mohr introducing the Elizabethan selections for the recorder (in fact, the remarks were better than the music).

Contributing to the total success of the evening was the special delight that always comes from knowing the performers personally (and the absence of contemporary music). Though the music was Western, the evening could hardly have gone off so splendidly without the help of the Chinese race, both on the performing and listening side. A large delegation from the Chinese Presbyterian Church in Los Angeles was in attendance and had just reason to be proud of Anthony Yu, who organized the whole affair and performed in his usual outstanding manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Paul K. Jewett, Music Critic
ON THE STUDENT COUNCIL ELECTIONS

I voted in the last student body election, but somehow I did not get the satisfaction which should come as one exercises this privilege. As I looked at the ballot I found that there were some fellows that I did not even know by sight. I tried to find out about them, but there seemed to be no way I could do this except by meeting with each of the individuals personally....

It seems to me that we do not really have a chance to get to know the views of those who are being elected. The Student Council seems to be more of a popular group than a representative governing body. At least, I do not know if some of the fellows I voted for represent my way of thinking in the least. I usually voted for the fellows I was acquainted with (sometimes very slightly) or if some fellow had rubbed me the wrong way at some distant time in the past I voted for his competitor....

It seems to me that we should (at a graduate seminary) make some provision for those voting to do so intelligently. We have all been trained and taught that this is one of the ultimate essentials in our type of government. In my inquiries before the election I found everyone to be bound by some tradition which said that there was a 'no campaigning' law here at Fuller. Whereas, I am not in favor of an 'all out' campaign which would feature posters, meetings, and vote solicitation and the many other things that go with a campaign, I do feel that we would profit by setting aside one chapel period during which each of the candidates for election could speak for a short time and express himself on the views which he feels are important to the student body and its proper well-being. This could be followed by an informal question and answer period in the refectory at which all of the candidates would be available for us to speak with them personally. In this way many of us could make a much more intelligent choice when we mark our ballots. I believe also it would give us a much better student government—one which is truly representative.

David Wead

CHAPEL

The chapel issue is one which is stimulating thinking, but very fuzzy thinking. On the one hand, it appears that compulsory chapel is needed to instill in the students a sense of worship. If the students cannot worship in chapel, how can they, as ministers, expect their people to worship under them? On the other hand, compulsory chapel is also needed to promote public relations. Naturally, both of these views should blend together in a manner which would be advantageous for students and seminary alike. But how can we talk about worship when there is no basic understanding of the concept of worship? Can worship and public relations be blended together without compromising both of them?

But the real question is a matter of compulsion. When we are forced to worship God, we are unable to be responsible participants in a community worship service. Community worship involves an interaction between the individual members. If a community is forced to worship together, individuals are forced to interest when some of them are incapable of such interaction because of temporary or sustained personal difficulties. Therefore a spirit of dishonesty rather than praise may prevail in forced worship.

Eric Johnson
CHARGE OF THE LIFE BRIGADE
(or the dangers of a 17 hour load)

by Michael Cassidy
with apologies to Tennyson, etc.*

Half a book, half a book
Half a book onward.
All in the Valley of Life
Toiled the three hundred.
Forward the Life Brigade,
Charge for the Grades, they said.
Deep in the Valley of Life
Toiled the three hundred.
Forward, the Life Brigade!
Was there a man dismayed?
Only all those who knew
One had not blundered.
Their not to reason why
Their just to hasten by
Their but to do or die.
All in the Valley of Life
Toiled the three hundred.

Hebrew to the right of them
Greek to the left of them
Speech to the front of them
Volleyed and thundered.
Stormed at with clock and bell
Boldly they toiled and well
Right in the Jaws of Life
But quite near the Mouth of Hell
Toiled the three hundred.

Heavy the spirits there
Loaded with weight and care
Struggling to keep at prayer
Charging at Life, while
Nobody wondered.
Plunged in doctrinal Smoke
Right through the course they broke;
Yankee and Alien
Reeled from the Devil's stroke
Shattered and sundered.
Then they went forth
But not the three hundred.

Quizzes to right of them
Papers to left of them
Deadlines behind them
Stormed at with clock and bell
Till none in a state to tell
How thro' the Jaws of Death
How from the Mouth of Hell
Jesus had led them,
Led the three hundred.

How did their glory fade?
'Twas that wild charge they made,
While nobody wondered.
But honor the grades they made,
Honor the Life Brigade,
Well-meaning three hundred.

* Written in 1959 this was designed for posthumous publication but an
editor's desperation touched the author's heart and led him to resus-
citate these old bones which perhaps would have been better left
buried. MC
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STUDENT COUNCIL CORNER -

From the Old Prexy -

For the first time in three years, the Student Council is
proud to announce that the year-book will appear this June. It
will be on a smaller scale than previous years, but at least it
is a step in the right direction.

During this year the Council also gave a considerable amount
of time representing you and your interests during the various stages
of the Seminary's ten year planning conference.

The constitution revisions were not passed because they lacked
eight more votes to have a two-thirds majority of the student
membership; however, I want to thank the council committee which
spent many hours in preparing these revisions.

This has been a good year. I have had a very energetic and
efficient council to work with in student affairs. Members of the 1961-1962 Council: I thank you.

Richard Anderson

From the New Chief -

I would like to express my deep appreciation to you for the honor of being elected Student Body President. I consider it a privilege to be able to serve you in this capacity.

It is my firm conviction that the Council exists for the students. We want to promote those activities and interests which you consider desirable. To do this, we need to know what you are thinking and what you would like to see accomplished. May I encourage you to feel perfectly free to come to me or to any Council member at any time to share your ideas, suggestions, or gripes.

I also believe very firmly in the basic principle of proper chain-of-command (good Navy term). If we observe these channels we shall be able to accomplish more and shall be acting as mature, responsible men and women. The Student Council is the constitutionally appointed body to represent the students. If there are matters to be taken up with the administration or faculty which concern the student body as a whole, these are established channels and procedures.

I believe in wide participation in student affairs. There are a number of opportunities available for participation in committees and staffs, such as Employment-Housing representative, Social Committee members, Year Book staff, MIP and Practical Evangelism Committee members, etc. We hope that many of you will become involved in one of these areas of student participation.

Dick Anderson has given me a briefing on the Council's activities this past year and I have been amazed at the quantity and quality of work produced by this year's Council. The new Council will be considering the recommendations passed on to us; by the next issue of this paper we should be able to give you a better indication of our direction and plans for next year.

Alex Aronis

**CORRECTION---**

In the April 1962 issue of the opinion on page 4 the underlined portion of the following sentence was regretfully left out of the article "Alienation and Redemption in the Modern Novel:" It is this awareness that the world is morally ambiguous in its essence and that the fall of man is in reality "human guilt experienced without reference to any law" that drove Clamence to become a "judge-penitent."

---
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