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INTRODUCTION

I have become convinced, as I have pondered over the closely related questions of the authority and inspiration of the Bible, that John Calvin's approach to authority and B. B. Warfield's approach to inspiration are quite inadequate. Both men in their own way tried to escape the sweat, toil, and anxiety that inheres in a truly inductive approach to these crucial issues. Calvin incorrectly assumed that by means of the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit he could establish the authority of the Scriptures beyond all doubt and above all induction and human judgment. B.B. Warfield failed to become truly inductive in his approach to inspiration by wrongly assuming that the phenomena of Scripture—the critical data—had nothing whatever to do with indicating the Scripture writers' views of inspiration and were irrelevant for formulating a doctrine of inspiration.

In two articles for the opinion I shall develop more fully each one of these two criticisms in its turn.

I. A CRITIQUE OF CALVIN'S VIEW OF THE INNER TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

A. Calvin's View

According to Calvin the question of the authority of Scripture, as well as many of the weighty matters of higher and lower criticism, is not finally nor even primarily to be settled by an inductive method even by those committed to the Christian faith. On the contrary, this is a matter that must be settled quite above human judgments of any kind or the judgments of any human institution (the Church).

As if the eternal and inviolable truth of God depended upon the decision of men! For they mock the Holy Spirit when they (the Romanists) ask: Who can convince us that these writings came from God? Who can assure us that Scripture has come down whole and intact even to our very day? Who can persuade us to receive one book in reverence but to exclude another....(I. vii. 1)?

The Romanists say that the Church decides these issues. But Calvin says: Yet, if this is so, what will happen to miserable consciences seeking firm assurance of eternal life if all promises of it consist in and depend solely upon the judgment of men (I. vii. 1)?

Calvin's discussion is directed to those within faith.
EDITORIAL

Though the issue of compulsory class attendance has been resolved in favor of the student in the majority of graduate and professional schools across America, the issue continues to plague Fuller Theological Seminary. Presently the Faculty is once again considering the elimination of such out-moded regulations. To the crescendo of voices raised in favor of non-compulsory attendance we add our voice of support. Recognizing the difficulties this might produce for certain departments (i.e. speech and homiletics) and for students on probation, we nevertheless feel that the advantages will greatly profit both student and faculty alike.

Primarily, we feel these rules are unnecessary. Most students are capable of determining the value of class attendance. If they are not, they do not belong here. This is a graduate school, made up of students who will be entering the ministry of the church. If they are not responsible individuals by now, no coddling by the mother image will develop this. Non-compulsory class attendance will restore to the student the freedom which is rightfully his to determine his own value system in relationship to time and studies. This will encourage, rather than discourage, the maturing of the individual.

Secondarily, we feel it is wrong to consider unlimited cuts as a reward for students with a 3.5 average or better. This places an unnatural emphasis on grades rather than education. Certain keen students are satisfied with a 3.0 because of their desire to develop their complete personality and abilities while at seminary. Many last year felt the trip to San Francisco to hear Karl Barth was valuable enough to miss certain lectures at Fuller.

The reasons advanced in opposition to non-compulsory attendance are usually negative in nature. To these we merely say, "Yes, there might have to be some adjustments made by certain professors in their classroom habits." But remember, we came voluntarily to study under the Faculty at Fuller. If we had enough reasons and enough desire to come here, then the Faculty should show faith, in return, by abolishing compulsory class attendance.

...RES

SCRIPTURE (con't.)

No, Calvin thought that he had a method by which he could establish the authority, the canon, and the essential integrity of the Scripture beyond all doubt quite above the vicissitudes of human reason and induction.

If we desire to provide in the best way for our consciences—that they may not be perpetually beset by the instability of doubt or vacillation, and that they may not also boggle at the smallest quibbles—we ought to seek our conviction in a higher place than human reason, judgments, or conjectures, that is, in the secret testimony of the Spirit (I. vii. 4).

Indeed, it is not quite right to subject the Scripture to proof and reasoning.

Let this point therefore stand: that those whom the Holy Spirit has inwardly taught truly rest upon Scripture, and that Scripture indeed is self-authenticated; hence, it is not right to subject it to proof and reasoning. And the certainty it deserves with us, it attains by the testimony of the Spirit.... Therefore, illumined by his power, we believe neither by our own nor by anyone else's judgment that scripture is from God: but above human judgment we
affirm with utter certainty (just as if we were gazing upon the majesty of God himself) that it has flowed to us from the very mouth of God by the ministry of men. We seek no proofs, no marks of genuineness upon which our judgment may lean (I. viii. 5). ²

It is necessary at this point to ask two crucial questions. What could we say to someone who believed and taught something contrary to what we believed about the authority of the Bible who also claimed to be taught by the secret testimony of the Spirit? Also how do we know that all that we confidently assert as the work of the Holy Spirit is not Satan disguising himself as an angel of light (I. ix. 2)? Or to state both questions in one sentence, how do we certainly know that it is the Holy Spirit that is the cause of our convictions about the Bible in our own case, and that it is something other than the Holy Spirit which is the cause of the convictions of those who disagree with us? The answer which Calvin gives is that we see the image of the Holy Spirit which he has stamped upon the Scriptures; we recognize Him in his own image in the Word. This image and the inner testimony must agree with one another (I. ix. 2, 3).

B. Criticism of This View

There is much in Calvin's thought at this point that we ought not to dismiss easily. But there is one point at which this great man was wrong. This inner testimony does not settle the question of authority above all human judgment and give to us complete certainty, free from all doubt. This is wholly impossible from the human point of view—and being human, that is the point of view that we must work from. How can we have certainty of something that is above our own judgment? Only if we receive a revelation from God that is self-authenticated can this be accomplished. But the secret testimony of the Holy Spirit is manifestly not self-authenticated. For it could be Satan in disguise; moreover, one must check his inner testimony against the image of the Holy Spirit in the Bible. Does

² We must balance this statement of Calvin with his teaching on the indicia of Scripture from which it is possible for the believer to observe a certain majesty in Scripture. Calvin does not despise this kind of subjecting the Scripture to "proof and reasoning" so long as this is only secondary to the secret testimony. However, this quote, it seems, would rule out in Calvin's view the validity of the critical approach to the Scripture exercised by most modern biblical scholars or a critical examination by one not committed to the Christian faith. Such men are "sharp-nosed faultfinders (I. viii. 11)," and their utterances are the "bawling of rascals (I. vii. 9)" "who are babblers with more than canine shamelessness (I. viii. 10)."

³ The question of how we know what the causes are that give rise to our convictions is one of the most profound of all epistemological questions. Some would say that our conviction does not rise from a supernatural cause, but a natural one. They might say that the various opinions about the Bible are due to the normal processes of induction that arise from considering the indicia of Scripture. Others might give a psychological explanation for our conviction; they might say that this is ultimately due to a projected father image or that it is an attempt to escape the anxiety due to an overactive superego that makes it impossible for us to adequately express our libido, etc., etc., ad infinitum. When we assign the Holy Spirit as the cause of our conviction, we wax bold in faith; when we assert that we know beyond all doubt that the Holy Spirit is the cause of our conviction and that He is not the cause of the convictions of any who disagree with us, our audacity becomes astronomical.
it not strike you as strange that Calvin is addressing believers to tell them how to think in order to deliver them from doubt and the vicissitudes of human opinion only to tell them that they already are convinced by the Holy Spirit above all doubt and have utter certainty? Whence, therefore, comes the question about and the experience of Christian doubt? What is there left to do but to cry out, "Speak for yourself, John!" For I do doubt. If Calvin has read the inner testimony correctly, then I must assume that the Holy Spirit is doing a poor job in my case---a mighty poor one!

Calvin's teaching on the inner testimony is a teaching that comes from the top down. It stands over against us and high above us even as the Scripture itself does. It is as a secure and impregnable fortress sitting high on a hill with every entrance marked by a sign. "Exit Only." If Calvin would but remember that he does not stand on Mt. Olympus looking down, but on the plain of human experience looking up, he would find himself outside of his own system.

Therefore let this conclusion most certainly stand. Apart from a self-authenticated revelation—which the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit emphatically is not, on Calvin's own testimony—there is no possibility of arriving at utter certainty above human judgment. There is absolutely no way on the principles set forth by Calvin to criticize a Mohammeden who might say, "Allah testifies within me that the Koran is His holy Word." If one has a given body of material that claims to be revelation, has an inner conviction within (which he asserts is due to divine influence) that this material is revelation, and if his conviction agrees with the image of the divine stamped on that body of material which claims divine authority, he has fulfilled all the requirements of Calvin. Then who is to decide among the different conclusions that men applying these principles might well come to? There is no place left to turn but to the slippery realm of induction and the vicissitudes of human judgment.

C. Some Modern Examples of How This Teaching of Calvin is Used

I should like to discuss the way in which Cornelius Van Til and Gordon Clark employ this doctrine. Now if I am to proceed honestly, I must admit that I have read only small amounts of the writings of each man and do not have anything like a comprehensive understanding of their systems. Thus, my remarks are impressions.

The approach seems to be along these lines. Apart from special revelation, man's ability to find truth is in the worst kind of condition. Clark dismisses general revelation as being inherently inadequate to give us any kind of significant guidance in the areas of moral ideals, ethical norms, right concepts of God, or even to help us significantly in such questions as choosing between atheism or theism, and infinite or finite God, and whether the universe is neutral or sympathetic toward values (G. H. Clark, "Special Divine Revelation as Rational," Revelation and the Bible, ed. C. F. H. Henry, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955, p. 28). Sin, of course, corrupts general revelation, but there is an inherent defect in all of the above named areas as well. Reason (as a source of truth), induction, scientific method, empiricism—all of these seem not to brighten this gloomy picture one whit. All these alike lead to skepticism (pp. 29, 33-35, 37, 41).

If, in Van Til, we should make any gain in the inherent adequacy of general revelation, it is more than demolished by the effects of sin so that the unregenerate mind (and the regenerate man as well to a considerable extent) may be compared to a jaundiced eye that sees all things yellow (C. Van Til, "Introduction," The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible by B. B. Warfield, ed. S. G. Craig, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1943, pp. 20, 24).
One gets the decided feeling that the situation is black, blacker, blackest. How can we test the several messages that claim to be revelations from God? Can man test these in any significant way to see if there is one genuine revelation? The answer would seem to arise from hollow blackness, "Nevermore!"

What then shall we do? Commit suicide? Ah, now comes the existential moment! The secret testimony of the Holy Spirit! Yes! Yes! That is it! This is the means by which we shall be swept from the Tartarus of human attempts to find truth straightway into the propositional written verbally and plenarily inspired revelation of God quite beyond the vicissitudes of human judgment, free from every doubt. (Clark, p. 39). From this lofty pinnacle they can then freely cast the stones of criticism, dismissing with ease the host of human philosophies, all other religions, and all Christian theologians such as Roman Catholics, Arminians, and many not-so-strict Calvinists except for their particular brand (Clark, pp. 27-28; Van Til, pp. 20, 48-49, 51ff, 57ff).

Van Til is not even content to lay down his secret "sword of the Spirit" at this point. Not only can this secret weapon bring one safe and sound into the Scriptures; it can also be used to secure rather exact definitions in systematic theology for a doctrine of Scripture. Scripture is a revelation (which means an "existential system" for Van Til), is perspicuous, sufficient; it is objective, consists of supernatural propositions, and is inspired. All of these convictions are claimed to be wrought by the Holy Spirit. So far as I am concerned, this is simply putting the seal of Divine approval on one's own speculations in systematic theology. For me to this would be arrogance.

Inasmuch, however, as this inner testimony does not rescue one from the realm of human judgment and induction, the approach of these men is invalid. While they apparently think that they secure the truth of Christianity beyond doubt, in reality theirs is the voice of skepticism and the council of agnosticism. From the point of view of epistemology (theory of knowledge), on the basis of their principles we never successfully pass beyond that dark word "Nevermore!"

Dr. Carnell in his book, Christian Commitment, speaks about an issue so closely related to the one of which I am speaking that I do not hesitate to quote him in this context.

I am not unfamiliar with the clamant protests of those who say that if God and man have anything in common, the Creator-creature relation is effaced and God no longer rules man with a sovereignty that is discontinuous with creation. But do these zealots realize what they are asserting? Unless God and man have something in common, it is impossible to make meaningful judgments about God. Hence, if one elects to guard God's sovereignty by denying that God and man share some point of identity, he should prepare for the fact that nothing significant can be known or said about God—not even that there is a God, let alone that God is a person (p. 137).

But if God and man are not analogically related, one can posit as many mediators (such as a church, a Bible, or a priestly cast) as he wants, and we are left in moral skepticism (p. 141; cf. pp. 135-142).

D. Defense of the Inductive Approach

All of the above thinkers, except Dr. Carnell, would insist that the inductive approach to the question of the authority of the Scriptures is wrong in spite of all my critical witticisms, Thus I must offer a few words of clarification and defense of this method.
We often distinguish between induction carried on within Scripture from that carried on outside of Scripture. I am primarily thinking of the latter sense in this article. I am not even sure that "induction" is a good word for what I wish to describe. Perhaps "coherence" is better. By induction I mean the attempt of men to try to formulate thought constructions that do justice to all of the data of human experience. Inductive method seems to include reason or logic; for one must, it seems, try to order the statements in his body of hypotheses consistently if fruitful induction is to take place. This term as I am using it, also includes the empirical data from every kind of human experience. It includes the data of the inner reality which are accessible primarily only by introspection; it includes the data of the inner reality of others which they communicate to me in conversation and in personal encounter. It includes as legitimate data the convictions of the heart and the realities to which I am already committed by the fact of my existence. It includes the reading of the Bible or other books which claim to be revelation from God; it includes the data of the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit (if we conceive of the Holy Spirit's testimony as being a feeling of some sort) or the convictions and the results in our lives for which we assign the Holy Spirit as the cause (if we do not conceive of the inner testimony as a feeling).

It is my conviction that we cannot establish a doctrine of authority on any other basis than inductions, speaking from the point of view of epistemology. We must establish it in these slippery realms simply because there is no other way that works. For years I have tried to find ways to get around this conclusion; for I ardently long for greater security than this approach is able to give. When I realize that the conclusions which I have reached inductively must pass the acid test of death and the grave, I often tremble with fear.

I am also coming to the conviction that even those who deny the validity of the inductive approach to the question of authority often (if not always) covertly use it nonetheless. If this is so, they ought to admit it; if they admit it, they are morally obliged to confess that they believe that they have the ability and the intellectual wherewithal to carry on productive induction that gives one some semblance of truth. If they will not admit this when, in fact, they carry on such induction, they are immoral and irresponsible and dishonest men.

4. At this point I should like to point out that I do not deny that our conviction of the authority of Scripture is due to the inner testimony of the Spirit; I do not assert that this testimony is of no value. From God's point of view He may know full well that once his sovereign grace has acted, a man will never lose his faith regardless of evidence. May it be so! From man's point of view (and, unfortunately, this is the point of view that we must work from) he does not with certainty know this unless this testimony is self-authenticating, which it is not. Thus the asserted testimony of the Holy Spirit (or the results attributed to Him) simply becomes data—perhaps very significant data—among other data, to which men try to do justice in their induction, comparing experience with experience, criticizing one kind of data as against another.

(Next month Mr. Haitema's article will evaluate B. B. Warfield's approach to the inspiration of Scripture.—ed.)

*****
I read with considerable interest, and some exasperation, the article in last month's the opinion on abortion. Some of the points made by the author are good and well presented and are generally agreed upon by all concerned, such as doctors, lawyers, social workers and theologians. However, the most superficial glance at the article will reveal that it presents only one side of this most important matter; and it is in the hope that readers will arrive at a more balanced view that I here present a brief argument from the child's point of view. That there are opposing views is obvious from the fact that the law was not changed many generations ago in the direction the author would have desired. This is no new problem, but one which has engaged the interest of moral reformers and legislators down through the centuries. The only significant change in recent times is that therapeutic abortion can now be done with safe surgical skill and sterility, but this does not in any way change the moral issue as to whether the procedure is right or wrong.

The crux of the matter was glossed over very superficially in last month's article. Quoting Glanville Williams, the author says that the statement that the unborn child is a human being is a premise which is only a partial definition. This is true if we are considering only the physical and mental properties of the human being. In this narrow sense it is indeed only a partial definition, but there is more to a man than his body and mind. Even most non-Christians often concede this. The Christian position that man is a living soul should have a vital influence on our view of this matter if we are going to allow, as we should, spiritual convictions to affect our opinions and decisions.

No one will deny that a baby at the moment of birth is a human being in every sense, physical, mental and spiritual, even though all these attributes have to be developed to reach full adult maturity. Now let us think back just five minutes. The baby is about to be born. The nurse and doctor are ready. The mother knows that her travail has reached its climax and realizes that in a very few short moments she will have the exquisite joy of hearing her baby's first cry. Is the baby any less of a human being in that moment? Of course not. Let us go further back to the later months of pregnancy. Legally the foetus is "viable" at 28 weeks, though many have survived after even shorter periods of gestation. Technically this is the borderline between a miscarriage and a premature delivery. Is there any essential difference, apart from stage of development, between a foetus of 25 weeks and one of 30 weeks? I submit that the difference is purely embryological. Let us go further back still to "quickening". This usually takes place at about 16 weeks. The mother, already knowing she is going to have a child, can for the first time feel him kicking and moving about within her. This is one of the greatest thrills a woman can experience. Can she think of her child at this time as anything other than a human being in every sense? Does she think of him as flesh and bones only without an immortal soul? The idea is absurd.

There is only one more significant step backwards that can be taken, and that is to the moment when the foetus started its development. This is the moment of "impregnation" when the mature ovum, recently liberated from one of the mother's ovaries, is met and fertilized by the male gamete. This fusion of two cells is called a zygote and represents the beginning of a new individual. Before this union no such individual existed. This would seem to be the most reasonable moment

QUENTIN HYDER received his M.A., M.B. from Cambridge University in 1952 and 1955 respectively and did his internship at the London Hospital.
for the soul to be incarnated. It is utterly preposterous to imagine that God adds the soul at a later date in the development of the embryo as a sort of "extra." If twins result, it is because the zygote immediately divides into two, each half pursuing an independent development. At this point the Catholics would go even further and say, while still acknowledging the influence of genes and chromosomes, that it divides because God has put two souls into it.

It may be that at this point some have diverged in their opinion from the foregoing, but if you have come with me thus far the rest follows logically. If you will concede that a foetus is a living soul, as precious in the eyes of God at conception as at birth, full maturity or physical death, then at the very least, in the question of abortion, the child should be considered as of equal importance as the mother. Notice that I do not say as the Catholic Church is sometimes accused, whether rightly or wrongly, that the child should be considered above the mother, but that they should, from a spiritual point of view, be regarded as equals.

A second point made in last month's article which bothered me was the implication that to be born, other than under the most ideal circumstances of good social conditions and physical perfection, was worse than never to have been born at all. I appeal to anyone who holds this view to go to an institution for the blind and ask them if they would rather have never been born. Ask a man born a cripple if he would not rather have been given life, albeit with his limitations, than to never have lived. Ask a man who comes from a broken home or who was brought up in an orphanage if he would rather have had an end put to his life before he was even born. There are many people today living happy, integrated lives who had unhappy childhoods, even involving misunderstanding and rejection by their peers. Indeed, it is often these very people who make the best parents in their determination to give their children a better chance in life than they had. I appeal to the long view in the question of abortion. Consider the individual, whose life it is proposed to end before it has really begun in an independent sense, and consider his tremendous potential twenty or thirty years hence if given a chance. I personally know a man who was told by his father that he and his mother had tried unsuccessfully to destroy him as soon as his mother's pregnancy was discovered, because at the time it was extremely inconvenient for a variety of reasons for them to have children. That man, in his early twenties, became a born-again Christian and subsequently led others to a saving knowledge of Christ. He and others are glad that his parents failed, and that he is today very much alive; in spite of the inconvenience he caused them for a brief period.

Applying these arguments to the cases cited in last month's article I believe that a fairer conclusion will be reached than would have been possible by considering only one side. I repeat that I am not advocating child preference, but rather that both child and mother should be considered equally. In the cases of rape and hyperfertility, a perfectly normal, healthy child would probably result; and the above considerations should surely weigh heavily against any abortion being performed. In the cases of incest, psychosis and genetic poison there are still good chances that normal children would result and only in rare circumstances would the degree of abnormality be such that one might later regret that an abortion had not been performed. I submit that even in these cases the chances of a normal or relatively normal baby being born are sufficiently high to cause one to think very carefully before unequivocally advising a termination of the pregnancy.

The matters of love and the law, as raised in last month's article, are, of course, basically sound. We must truly treat the woman with love, but let us not neglect to love the child also who one day may well become much more worthy of love than his mother.

In the case of the law, the author, quoting James Newman, said, "since one
cannot legislate the practice out of existence it is folly to keep on the books laws which do not receive public sanction and observance." This sounds logical and one might at first sight tend to be sympathetic towards the view, but let us be very wary of letting "public sanction" influence us too much. In spite of our democratic tradition if we allow the majority to dictate such matters to us, standards will inevitably fall.

Abortion is an arresting moral problem, and like similar problems such as euthanasia, sterilization and the use of contraceptives, it will probably never be finally answered. There are always two sides to every question and it is to the end that these two sides be considered in this case that this has been written.

*****

STUDENT COUNCIL CORNER

NEW PRESIDENT One of the most dominant topics of conversation these days is the recurring subject of the new President. Plenty of rumors are floating around but I haven't been able to get any definite word. I have it on good authority, however, that a call has been issued. There is every hope that we will have a resident President in the fall and that his name will be announced in the next few weeks.

DISCUSSION ON PSYCHOLOGY The Lyceum Committee has planned several excellent events. One of which none of us will want to miss is a discussion on a subject of special interest for us here at Fuller: The Role of Psychology in the World Christian Mission. Drs. Bromiley, Cole, Fairweather, and Ladd will participate in the discussion. It will be on Monday night, Feb. 18th, at 8:00 P.M.

CONGRATULATIONS to our fine musicians, athletes, and hostesses. Tony Yu organized a very delightful evening of musical entertainment for the Student Recital. Another one, by the way, is scheduled for third quarter. Our ecumenical volleyball and basketball teams are still undefeated. They have beaten Claremont, California Baptist, and Talbot. And the girls in "the Slessor" have been providing warm, hospitable receptions for new students, other-seminary athletes and, of course, for TV watchers from 98 to 200 N. Oakland.

PRAYER CHAPEL The prayer chapel in the library building should be completely furnished within the month. It will be available for private prayer and devotions and for prayer groups. If there is an interest among the student body for a short vesper service before or after supper once or twice a week, the Council will be happy to make arrangements for it.

OPEN HOUSE OF MC ALISTE LIBRARY The Seminary will be having an open house of the new library building on Sunday afternoon, March 10th. A number of our pastors and friends would probably appreciate a visit to the library building and this will give us an excellent opportunity to take them through. In the past, seminarians have brought over their Sunday school classes or college and high school age groups and have made a big afternoon of it.

PROMOTIONAL BANQUETS The Seminary will be holding several promotional banquets in San Diego (Feb. 19), San Francisco (Feb. 28), and Seattle (April 19). If you have friends in these areas who would be interested in learning more about Fuller, you are invited to submit their names to Mr. Weber.

ALEX ARONIS
Student Council President
AN OPINION ON POLITICS

Conservatism in politics and economics need not dip to innuendo, exaggeration, and misstatement for presentation and/or defense. Unfortunately, however, spokesmen for the conservative cause at Fuller in recent years have tended toward these pitfalls, thus wreaking more harm than they have contributed good to their cause. Typical of this disheartening trend was the chapel message of Thursday, 31 January, in behalf of the Christian Freedom Foundation.

The speaker, a highly respected pastor, author, sometime educator, and Christian leader, devoted nearly twenty minutes to a denunciation of "liberal" (ambiguously related to "quasi-Communist") American economic policies. Bearing the main brunt of this verbal assault was the United States' Foreign Aid program.

All students must surely be aware that there have been, and there continue to be deficiencies in our foreign aid programs. However, to say that only one country (Italy) has been rescued from Communism by such assistance is, at best, misleading. Expert analysts hold that Greece (by admission of her own officials), Turkey, France, West Germany, Pakistan, and perhaps others have been strengthened against Communism, if not jerked from its drooling jaws.

Just as unfair is the broadcasting of an early-1962 split in the Organization of American States (OAS) over an United States-proposed censure of Fidel Castro. Two things present themselves here: first, Latin America has received less economic and military assistance than any other area of the world, including the Communist bloc (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, etc.). Only in the past two years has there been any concerted attempt to alleviate this embarrassing inequity, which more than once has haunted the United States at OAS gatherings. This obvious inadequacy in the foreign aid allocations of past years may well have influenced OAS decisions regarding Cuba, as it has numerous issues. Secondly, these same (OAS) countries voted unanimously to support the United States in its recent blockade against and de-missilization of Cuba. Unanimous OAS action is rather infrequent, so that this signalled a somewhat cardinal achievement by "Yanqui" diplomats. Both of these facts were conveniently overlooked by the speaker, as were a number of other more technical details of the assistance programs.

Let me append a final "for instance." The speaker urged that, as ministers of the Gospel, and as responsible Christian citizens, we press for an immediate change of foreign aid into goods and technical personnel, rather than monetary grants. Aside from the theological nuances involved here, more intensive research would have revealed that this has been the trend in our aid programs since a series of studies conducted by various organizations in 1955-60. Indeed, the formation of the Peace Corps is but a single, relatively minor manifestation of the increasing reliance upon personnel and supplies, rather than direct monetary rewards, in the foreign aid program.

This rather hastily-constructed rebuttal, drawn largely from recollections of research carried out as part of my undergraduate studies in Foreign Affairs, but implemented by a continuing interest in and attention to the subject, has mainly one object: to demonstrate that politico-economic conservatism is aware not only of the problems and shortcomings in our present national policies, but also of proposed solutions, as well as areas of value and merit.

There is a need for further revision and redirection of the foreign aid programs; there is a place for economic wisdom and thriftiness; there is a place
for budgetary honesty and clear-sightedness; there is a place for social action short of the welfare state. And these policies need neither be propagated nor defended through myopic manipulation or ignorance of the true situation. Mature conservatism maintains that a realistic purview of our present national quandary is sufficient to warrant major policy shifts and redirection.

Charles R. Landon, Jr.
B.A., Foreign Affairs, 1960
George Washington University

AN OPINION ON REBELLION

Mr. Whitacre's letter last month on rebellion has been a touchstone of thought on my part concerning rebels, rebellion, and such weighty matters of existence. So far I have written five letters to the opinion on the subject, none of which convey my feelings and reactions (and I may add rebellion) to the letter. I can most honestly and simply say I disagree almost in toto.

If I may have the freedom to be rebelliously hostile, I think the letter contains more rhetoric than content. Obviously such a comment is not consistent with the spirit of Christian love, and I can only be sorry for this lack for which I am sorry. But I am afraid I cannot claim action consistent with my commitment to Jesus Christ. My careless invectives and slamming damnations, my seething hatred and sexual fantasies betray only too well questionable character, and yet I am me even with these phenomena.

I am sorry that Mr. Whitacre feels the rebel must have so many 'musts.' (I count six.) If I could fulfill these 'musts,' I would be either Jesus Christ or Billy Budd, but I am neither and yet hope to be eventually like the former. In the meantime, accept me with my ambivalences as Christ has accepted me (some people call this justification). Don't tell me I must walk in love and patience when I know I don't; I am trying to, and somehow I foolishly believe that these efforts are acceptable to God, even efforts disguised by rebellion. For the Christian rebel is trying to live consistently with his commitment, especially one who would come to a seminary.

J. C. Meagor

AN OPINION ON the opinion

The last edition of the opinion has prodded me to look up the meaning of the term 'opinion.' Possibly the opinion has done this before; nevertheless I will chance monotony and repeat the definition found in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (based on Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, 1953), p. 589a: An 'opinion' is a "belief stronger than impression, less strong than positive knowledge." It implies "having been thought out," yet it remains "open to dispute." Thus, we may conclude, the opinion voices evaluated beliefs which may be open to dispute. And a noble service that is.

However, one problem has made itself apparent to me, possibly to others as well. The last edition displayed—at least superficially—a singular lack of coherence. That lack makes me wonder whether the opinion lacks editorial policy. The standards look impressive, judging by the footnotes. On the other hand, are standards and policies identical?

The effect of this edition on me may best be described as blurred and surrealistic. I felt as though I were trying to run through an oriental bazaar. Excluding pages nine and ten, I found it quite a change of pace moving from a
sober, scholarly article on abortion to an intensely personal missionary letter, then on to a dialectical exercise from the Talmud, and finally to a bright satire on the "compleat" theological library. It does not seem an overstatement to say that the four articles are as different as night and day...and night and day.

How should the effect be interpreted? With all respect to the authors and editors concerned, I have the impression that this issue inclined toward display. I also infer a possible lack of seriousness on the part of the editors. Finally it seems that the opinion has become rather like a tabloid.

I feel certain that I have misunderstood this issue of the opinion, and I do not pretend to be a censor or arbiter, for after all my comments also form nothing more than an opinion.

Phil Caldeen

INCIDENT-LY

I have been asked by FMF to share an incident from the past month's experience with Middler Year in Missions in Africa. It is hoped that this will serve to remind us that the FMF Missionary Conference will soon be held.

Behind the home in which the team stayed during the Mission in Pietermaritzburg, was a huge park. I occasionally walked over to the park because I found it an ideal place to read and to pray. One morning during the second week of the mission I went to a cricket field in the park to work on a sermon. Across this huge field I noticed a young fellow reading while his dog was getting some exercise. After a while he began drifting over towards me and eventually came over to my bench. He obviously wanted to talk. Almost immediately he spotted the Bible I had among my books. This seemed to be the stimulus he needed to open up. He began by saying that he had recently purchased a Bible and in fact was reading it while sitting across the park. As he produced a new looking Bible from his pocket he continued, "But I was having trouble really understanding what it means." He said that he had hoped someone would explain some things to him. So we chatted for the next half an hour, talking most of the time about how one becomes a Christian. I gave Alan my phone number and he disappeared with his dog.

About 2 weeks later I got a phone call just as I was going out to a meeting. It was Alan. He said he wanted to talk again. As I met him later that evening, I discovered that he wanted to commit his life to Christ. It was refreshing for a change to find myself in a situation that I had neither structured nor arranged.

Dick Peace.

the opinion is published the first Wednesday of each month throughout the school year by students at Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 N. Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, California. the opinion welcomes a variety of opinions consistent with general academic standards. Therefore, opinions expressed in articles and letters are those of the authors and are not to be construed as the view of the seminary, faculty, student council, or editors of the opinion.

Editorial Board
Willard A. Parker............Editor-in-chief
Ralph B. Wright, Jr.........Managing editor
P. Carter Doran...............Consultant