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REFLECTIONS ON...

by Eric Johnson

Man is doomed to productivity, to individualism and to uniqueness. Grasping and coping, he may begin to understand his worth and uniqueness and to have the courage to explore the promised land called personality. If he ventures into the promised land, he must cope with its vast, uncharted regions and face the threat of annihilation. However, he can escape, deny his uniqueness and worth, thus becoming a shell, a robot whose life is planned and charted in the "brave new world."

The "brave new world" is not a new phenomenon. Although the perils it presents today are more devious and devilish, it has existed since time immemorial. The need for security is inherent in human nature; thus, structure, purpose, and direction become necessary elements in the life of the individual. The problem arises as to how to deal with purpose, structure, and direction: whether to accept external motivations and systems that give complete answers to life's perplexities, or whether to accept internal motivations and systems that develop and reveal meaning as life is lived. Living demands answers; consequently, there is a keen temptation to choose simple answers to questions of life. In this case, purpose and direction become an external structure, or response to a stimulus, rather than a creative eruption of the inner flow of the person who determines his own meaning and purpose and who examines the values of others as they relate to his own values. Indeed, external value structures can be found in every idea garden plot. The garden plot of religious ideas is an especially fertile area. Only here can the ultimate structure be found.

People are grasping for meaning and purpose; the proponents of religion are eager to furnish such meaning. First, the neophyte seeks a system to which he can give himself completely. Second, he strives to conform to the system with a perfect conformity. Man-made Christianity and in turn man-made God offer him such a system. Structural elements are erected and vary from area to area. In one area the authoritarian God is set up for man to worship; thus, man can chant, "I am nothing; He is everything." The variety of structural elements is immense: the victorious life, praying, testifying, reading the Bible, not drinking or going to shows, etc. The beauty of such a system only becomes apparent after the system has been constructed. Now the neophyte has appropriate avenues for becoming a full-fledged member in the system while he is glorifying God; he will fight to the death for his religious convictions. In fact, his last gasping breath is, as he heads for "glory," "I never compromised my testimony." One who lives in such a Christianity-system has found a god, the only true god in the universe; therefore, he has the responsibility to decide for others--his own god has to be their god also. When man worships the god he creates, he fears freedom. Freedom given to the neophyte who finds his being in this framework is always a threat because it may break the structural bondage; thus there will be no need for god.

Then the neophyte realizes that perfect conformity to the Christianity-system is necessary, but perfect conformity is difficult, for he is an imperfect

(con't. p. 2.)
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EDITORIAL

Dialogue is a necessary ingredient of theological education. The purpose of the opinion is to promote such dialogue. For this reason we applauded the initiative of the Lyceum Committee in instituting forum discussions where various views of faculty and students could be aired. Unfortunately the first attempt at openness failed.

In the recent forum on psychology, the spirit of dialogue was not grasped by all participants. An exchange of hostility is no substitute for an exchange of ideas. The method of dialogue was not employed. Unwillingness to answer all questions put forth makes interaction impossible. The purpose of dialogue was lost. The goal is not to convert those who differ from us but to understand them.

Is free discussion of controversial issues then impossible at Fuller? We think not. However, certain attitudes must prevail. We are all Christian gentlemen; and though we disagree in points, we still have the same basic convictions. We cannot view these forums as Roman Circuses or gladiatorial battles. We need a better defined set of ground rules enforced by the Lyceum Committee. And in these discussions we cannot have any sacred cows.

We appreciate the willingness of the faculty in appearing on the recent panel. We also appreciate the earnestness of their convictions. We are confident that the unsolved issues of this forum discussion will be answered in the near future and that Fuller will become a stronger seminary because of her willingness to discuss openly all issues.

the editors

REFLECTIONS ON...(con't.)

human. Logically, the answer lies in steadfast prayer and meditation, a short life, and quick trip to heaven. Being saved from the world, the neophyte has his home in heaven. The sooner he reaches heaven the better off he is. Complete victory means a complete escape from life—escape from living and the responsibilities entailed in it. Complete victory means death. Only in death has the neophyte achieved full-fledged membership, a perfect individual in a perfect system.

Christ was aware of the human predicament—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Indeed, a value system can offer the individual security. Also, it can be a weapon of hate and destruction: someone forces his value system onto Mr. X; Mr. X forces his value system onto Mr. Y. The Pharisees offer a noble example and provide a lesson on how to use God, ethics and morals as tools of hate and destruction. For them, man had no worth other than his ability to ape the system, following and conforming perfectly to its structure. Individual worth was capable of precise measurement.

The modern Pharisee is more complex and subtle than his older counterpart. He has become a scientist whose advertising ability, salesmanship, and consistent psychological logic has enabled him to become as effective as the modern corporation in achieving his goals. The modern Pharisee gains a new perspective from his Western society. An example of the perspective gained is found in the use to which he has put the secular concept: market orientation. In market orientation, marriage, for instance, is discussed in terms of the salability of the personality. One attractive package—a person who comes from a good background, has an
adequate education, and has a promising future—can demand a mate whose personality package has approximately equal worth on the personality market. The modern Pharisee can apply "market orientation" to the Christianity-system: he can wrap God up and put Him in a neat little package, a package whose walls can be four laws of salvation or ten steps to Christian maturity. After he has been packaged, God can be put on the personality market. When God is put in an attractive box, He will be a desired commodity whose worth will increase as the demand increases.

Indeed, the Pharisee is indebted to culture; culture has taught him the art of manipulating his fellow man. People and machines become equal and their value is determined by their productivity, a productivity measured by the pastor, the foreman, and others. Modern Pharisees and their proselytes become objects; they have split their beings into emotional and intellectual elements, followed by an attempt to live by their intellectual elements. Hitler could kill five million Jews, intellectually justifying his actions. In turn, the modern Pharisee can retreat from mechanistic society to set up his own mechanistic society with its do's and don'ts. The modern Pharisee can live by his intellect. He can deny man's worth, integrity and freedom. Intellectually he can say, "Christ died for a wretch like me, a mouse like me." He denies that he is a man, but his manhood remains to haunt him.

The deep mysteries of life lie in the realm of personality. The individual has to search heaven and earth to find his being. He has to have some concept of values in life before he can become a Christian. The inner man cries out for meaning but he won't be structured, directed or pressed into a mold.

Christ is concerned with the inner man— from the heart flows the real man. Christ is concerned with the inner man, with his salvation and continued growth. However, the inner man must first be loved and accepted for what he is, not moralized or criticized or forced into a foreign structure. Who will or can initiate such a first love? God's first love for the world thus becomes the springboard for self-realization.

The modern Pharisees defeat themselves, for they criticize and moralize, push others into a structure, try to produce guilt in others in an effort to protect their security and to prevent others from experiencing second love, love between man and man. Although God first loved men, they must mediate this first love to second love. It is difficult finding second love, because a doctorate or preaching license does not guarantee the acquisition of the ability to love. Love, by definition, cannot be earned, bought or bargained for.

The modern Pharisees may have experienced first love through God, but they have never experienced second love through their fellow man. God's love, flowing through the love and acceptance of man, has not become a reality for the modern Pharisee because he has never found second love through his fellow man. Christianity is a growing process: the inner man is pointing toward a greater ability to love, to give one's very being to another, to accept another in a particular growth stage. Acceptance of the person is necessary even though what the person does may be unacceptable. Growth depends upon whether the individual, as he tests each stage, feels secure enough in that stage to go on to another. The modern Pharisees must remain in a static, immature stage of growth. Their inner men flow forth with criticism and hate, damnation and judgment because they must protect themselves. Consequently, they never transgress the primary stage because their fellow Pharisees are unable to love them or to understand that this is a necessary stage of growth and to realize that their inner men are eager to be productive, loving and growing.

Christ does not offer simple answers to simple problems. Life and love are not simple, but complex. To live is to love and suffer with the whole being. Learning to love includes the whole being throughout a whole lifetime.
II. A CRITIQUE OF B. B. WARFIELD’S APPROACH TO THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

In the introduction of my previous article, I made the assertion that B.B. Warfield’s approach to inspiration was not truly inductive and that this ought not to be. In this article, in contrast to the former one, I shall be using the word "induction" to apply primarily to the data within Scripture rather than to the data outside of it.

A. B. B. Warfield’s Approach

It seems to me that B.B. Warfield is able to be criticized at a great many points. This, however, would lengthen this article needlessly. Consequently, I shall primarily try to deal with a single point that is crucial to his entire thought on this subject.

It was B.B. Warfield’s firm conviction that the doctrine of inspiration must be established like any other doctrine—by the exegetical data of Scripture. The real issue was whether or not the apostles and the Lord were trustworthy teachers of doctrine (pp. 180, 181, 215).

Now who would argue with this? This sounds like a truly inductive approach. But the irony is that it is not a truly inductive approach as Warfield applied it. For, according to Warfield, some data of Scripture were irrelevant for establishing the views of inspiration held by the Scripture writers and for formulating our doctrine of inspiration. Which data were irrelevant? The phenomena of Scripture—the critical data. This is the crucial issue in Warfield.

When we approach the Scriptures to ascertain their doctrine of inspiration, we proceed by collecting the whole body of relevant facts. Every claim they make to inspiration is a relevant fact; every statement they make concerning inspiration is a relevant fact; every allusion they make to the subject is a relevant fact; every fact indicative of the attitude they hold towards Scripture is a relevant fact. But the characteristics of their own writings are not facts relevant to the determination of their doctrine (p. 206; cf. also pp. 202-205).

To suppose that the "facts" of Scripture (that is, the phenomena), the structure of Scripture, or the characteristics of the Biblical writings could have anything to do with indicating the views of inspiration held by the authors or that these were in any significant way relevant in formulating a doctrine of inspiration was a proposition which Warfield resisted with all of his power (p. 201 ff). One could be as inductive as he pleased so long as he excluded this segment of Scriptural data.

Warfield seems to have come to this conclusion on the basis of false analogy. To permit these data any relevance amounted to correcting and altering the true
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Biblical doctrine so far as Warfield was concerned. It was "precisely similar to saying that the Bible's doctrine of creation is to be derived not alone from the teachings of the Bible as to creation, but from the facts obtained through a scientific study of creation." Again, it was "precisely similar to saying that Mr. Darwin's doctrine of natural selection is to be determined not solely by what Mr. Darwin says concerning it, but equally by what we, in our own independent study of nature, find to be true as to natural selection" (p. 205). These data were relevant for testing the Biblical doctrine; but never under any circumstances could they modify it (p. 217).

Now there is just enough truth in these analogies to confuse the unwary; there is just enough falsehood in them to invalidate them as true analogies. Both of these analogies are false at this point. Mr. Darwin did not make natural selection; he only described it. The Bible did not make the universe; it only describes its creation. But the Scripture writers did make the Bible; it is their production. This distinction is of great significance. Admittedly when one formulates doctrines other than inspiration, it is only the statements of Scripture that constitute the relevant data. But the problem which confronts one when he is trying to formulate a doctrine of Scripture and inspiration is NOT ANALOGOUS to the situation which confronts him when he tries to formulate other Biblical doctrines—and this is precisely where Warfield went astray.

Since Warfield's analogies are not adequate, I have tried to think up one that was better. This one is not perfect either, but here it is: Suppose that we had a collection of art, in which there were sixty-six paintings, which correspond to our sixty-six canonical books in this analogy. Suppose that these sixty-six paintings had been produced over a period of around fifteen hundred years by approximately fifty men. Moreover, suppose that these paintings showed a remarkable likeness to one another in the basic theory that stood behind them in spite of their many great exterior differences so that it was with some ease that one could recognize all sixty-six paintings as proceeding from a single distinctive type or school. (This is to try to do some justice to the unity of Scriptures as well as the canon.)

Now let us suppose still further that these painters did some writing. But in all of the writings of all these men over this vast period of time, only a few of them ever spoke directly about the particular theory of art that stood in back of their distinctive paintings. Indeed, all of their formal statements on the subject combined would make up no more than one small paragraph. Suppose, however, that when these painters were writing on subjects other than their theory of art that not infrequently they used words and phrases which tended to appear distinctive and made various kinds of allusions to one another's paintings which also gave some hints and indications of their theory. Of course, these could not be as normative as their formal statements in determining their theory. 6

6. This is the sound hermeneutical principle. However, the significance that one attaches to these more detailed kind of data often depends upon one's preconceptions about the very doctrine that he is trying to formulate—the doctrine of inspiration. Warfield believed that the Scriptures were verbally and plenarily inspired, inerrant (p. 173), inspired in all its elements alike, whether matters of faith and morals or of science and history (pp. 113, 115), its words as well as its thoughts; even the subtleties and minute variations of words and order were considered worthy of the closest attention (p. 110). Perhaps it is worth pointing out that Warfield was out to defend this doctrine, being convinced that his doctrine was virtually synonymous with the historic Church doctrine and the Biblical doctrine. Believing that even the minute details of Scripture were, as it were, "laden with eternity," Warfield tended, it seems to me, to overemphasize the importance of the allusions made about the Scripture when the writers had no intention of teaching a doctrine of Scripture and were talking about other subjects. (con't. p. 6.)
Now suppose further that some student wanted to determine as precisely as possible the theory of art to which these ancient artists adhered. Would it strike you as preposterous under these circumstances if this fellow included as relevant data observations made from the study of the paintings themselves? You would answer, I am sure, "Of course not!"

Now in all fairness to Mr. Warfield, I must admit that it is possible that the theory of art adhered to by these artists was not properly reproduced in their paintings. So also, by analogy, it is possible that the Biblical writings may not reveal the same kind and degree of inspiration as its authors claimed for it. But would we assume such a discrepancy existed from the outset? God forbid! Rather, after cautioning ourselves that such a discrepancy may exist, we would proceed on the assumption that the characteristics of the productions were relevant data for formulating our doctrine until which time these data proved to be utterly irreconcilable with the few formal statements that we have on the subject. At this point these data would become a test of the doctrine of inspiration rather than data relevant for formulating it, even as Warfield says (pp. 217-218). But Warfield would have us regard these data as irrelevant from the outset, and in this he is wrong.

B. B.B. Warfield Did Not Adhere to His Own Method

It seems that the fine line between those kinds of details that were relevant and all-important for determining a doctrine of inspiration and those which were utterly irrelevant was such a fine and subtle line that even Warfield had trouble finding it. (See footnote No. 6.) For when the evidence of the use of Scripture (that is, the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers) looked favorable to his doctrine, he did not hesitate to use it (pp. 140, 149). However, it would seem that if it is relevant to use some instances of the use of Scripture, then this whole realm of data ought to be fair game. But once we enter into this area of data, we have entered one of the productive realms from which the critical data has come. From the use of the Old Testament Scripture by the New Testament writers comes such problems as quotations which do not correspond verbally with their sources, use of the Septuagint even when it contains inferior readings, the use of allegorical and a Rabbinic-type of exegesis, the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament, and the reinterpretation of Old Testament passages in a light that goes beyond and changes their primary and original meaning. This is an area of tough critical problems. Now Warfield was perfectly right in assuming that the use of Scripture was relevant data for showing the Scripture writers' view of inspiration. But this shows how difficult—if not impossible—it is to separate any of the phenomena and the critical data of Scripture from the rest of the data and declare them irrelevant. Warfield's appeal to the use of Scripture only helps confirm the fallacy of trying to make his kind of distinctions among the data.

One can say without contradiction that this sort of data is the very backbone of his doctrine. In this he was the victim of a false hermeneutic; once he left the formal statements that the Scripture writers made on the subject, which do not require anything near the rigorous and detailed doctrine of Warfield, he ought to have proceeded much more cautiously than he, in fact, did.

Equally serious is the fact that Warfield removed the closely related body of detail, called the phenomena of Scripture, completely out of the class of data deemed relevant for determining a doctrine of inspiration; this was arbitrary. In Warfield's approach we have the curious situation of having two very closely related kinds of detailed data arbitrarily divided, and one proclaimed as most important and the other absolutely denied as being relevant in the least.
C. A Comparison of Dr. Harrison's Approach to the Question of Inspiration with B.B. Warfield's Approach

Though it is my conviction that B.B. Warfield should be criticized at a number of other points, I have chosen to lay down the tool of criticism. The crucial issues are before us. B.B. Warfield overemphasized one kind of detailed data and underemphasized—yea, denied the relevance of—the other kind of detailed data with no clear way of distinguishing between the two. More illuminating than detailed criticism will be a comparison between the approaches of B.B. Warfield and Dr. Everett F. Harrison, whose love and devotion to the Scripture is witnessed by us all. All references for Dr. Harrison's statements come from his article in Revelation and the Bible (ed. C. F. H. Henry, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958).

1. Dr. Harrison does not speak directly to the issue of whether or not Warfield overemphasized the allusions made to Scripture when the Scripture writers were speaking on other subjects. He does, however, indicate that we should be careful about invoking the statements of Jesus about, and His attitude toward, the Old Testament with the same force as though the modern issues were in His mind (p. 238).

2. As for the phenomena of Scripture, Dr. Harrison states that the "problem is to define the nature of the inspiration in the light of the phenomena contained therein" (p. 239). Conservatives, Warfield notwithstanding, ought to join in and welcome criticism. This critical data is relevant for defining a doctrine of inspiration.

3. B.B. Warfield believed that inerrancy was certainly the Biblical doctrine and the point at which Bible-believing Christians must make their defense (p. 218). Dr. Harrison believes that the Bible does not require us to hold to inerrancy necessarily (pp. 238, 250).

4. B.B. Warfield believed that inspiration (and thus inerrancy, I presume) extended to all elements alike, whether in matters of faith and morals or of science and history (pp. 113, 115). While the following comments on Dr. Harrison's views need not be regarded as the opposite of Warfield's, they reveal something of a different approach. He believes that we must be careful in considering the purpose of the writer; in the case of numbers in the Bible, for example, the author did not always intend to be precise (p. 241). Again, the writers altered the wording of their sources and did not quote verbatim; similarly, John, in particular, took freedom in the expression of Jesus' sayings (pp. 243, 247). There is no inspired order of narration in the synoptic gospels; there is only a broad chronological pattern within which considerable freedom is taken (p. 245). Finally, Dr. Harrison holds open the possibility that Scripture writers may have quoted their sources on occasion without removing their errors.

5. Finally, the way in which the two men handle difficulties is to be contrasted. According to B.B. Warfield, we must come to the Scripture with a very strong presumption that it contains no errors and that any phenomena which seem to be otherwise are really so in appearance only. The reality of these phenomena cannot be admitted unless they can rise to the level of demonstration and unless their total evidential value is greater than the whole mass of the evidence which proves the Scripture writers to be trustworthy teachers of doctrine. It is better to leave these data unharmonized than to admit any inconsistency with our view of inspiration; neither can such data alter our doctrine (pp. 215-220). Dr. Harrison believes that difficulties are not to be underrated or dismissed (p. 250). Rather than having an immense presumption against them, supposing them to be in appearance
only, and leaving them unharmonized, if the evidence looks convincing, we must simply revise our doctrine of inspiration (pp. 250, 259). This is not to be construed as meaning that we overhaul our doctrine at the drop of a hat; yet, nonetheless, inductive study is to go on in a normal fashion without any immense presumption against any of the data; and should enough difficulties of a certain kind arise so that they present a convincing case (even though it may be short of demonstration), we must alter the doctrine.

It is especially at this point of how one ought to handle difficulties that Dr. Harrison shows himself to be truly inductive, and B.B. Warfield does not.

------

ON TRAINING DRAGON SLAYERS

by Robert Hill

There is a castle where young men spend three years to learn to be knights. There are other castles for this purpose; but this particular one specializes in training knights who can slay dragons. The others mainly teach the would-be-knight how to keep away from dragons, or pacify them, to get along in the king's court, chivalry and all that. But dragon-slaying is the real business of the knight, so the most ancient manuals say. And so this castle is in the stream of historical tradition.

As one tours the grounds of the castle he is impressed with the bustle of activity. Here is a group busily learning how to sharpen two-edged swords and javelins. Over there is a group being fitted for helmets. The head needs the best protection. Dragons are particularly fond of aiming their flaming breath at the head. Across the way, some men are learning how to sit a horse and to make the charge properly. Up in one of the turrets a few are intensely studying the history of the art and drawing many relevant applications for today, as well as eliminating a lot of "popular" but false theories of dragon slaying. The third year knights are trying to fit all this together, as in full armor they charge back and forth on the castle grounds, jousting with each other. On the week-ends the whole castle goes out to try their hand at the real thing. There's usually some excitement on Mondays when the knights return to share their experiences with the country-side dragons.

But what about the professors' week-end? Reports were sometimes rumored about that the professors occasionally went out to slay a dragon or two themselves. But no one really knew if they did or how they did it. The professors surely did not let on; and they went out alone. Their concern seemed to be with what went on in the castle.

One professor was in charge of "out trips," and he had a committee of students, those who reveled in the slaying and who were known slayers. This, of course, is not to say the other professors were not equally concerned with how the knights were slaying the dragons. They often talked about this very thing among themselves, and had the highest hopes that their pupils would be proficient in the art. But it didn't occur to them to go out with them, to encourage them and to see how they did it or didn't do it. Perhaps they thought everything was fine "outside," or maybe they were a little afraid they might be called upon to demonstrate, and they wouldn't want to set a bad example.

Suspicion grew that the professors knew a lot about the theory, but little
of the practice. They stayed in the castle, throwing toy spears into paper
dragons. Of course they had an answer. "Somebody has to be devoted to the
theory." Yes, but what good is the theory if the professor teaching it can't
show how it works on the real dragons?

The castle is still producing knights, and some are fine dragon slayers.
But many of them wish their training could have gone at least one step further,
with professors demonstrating how they put the theory and practice together in
some slaying of real-dragons. These knights believe they could have become a
little more excited about the theory.

****

ON TRAINING PSYCHOLOGISTS

For several reasons the decision of whether or not to establish a special
school of psychology and counseling at Fuller in 1965 is a difficult one. Let
me describe the present situation, as I understand it. Fuller has been promised
$60,000 per year for the next 15 years to underwrite part of the cost of the
school, if we should decide to establish it. This is only part of the cost, not
a full underwriting of it.

The present financial status of the school is that we are having a fair
amount of difficulty in raising our yearly operating budget. The budget of the
new school would be separate from the present budget and would have to be sep­
arately raised, yearly.

Everyone recognizes the great need today for counselors who combine the in­sights of psychology with a strong Christian faith. Further, because of the new­ness of the field there is a great need for research in the almost completely
unexplored area of the integration of psychology and Christianity. Those who are
offering this grant to Fuller are decided that such a school will be established
somewhere. The question facing us is whether it should be established here.

At present, psychology is being used in a supportive role at Fuller—that
of giving prospective ministers, missionaries, and Christian workers a valuable
tool in their work of the gospel. It is one of a number of disciplines that
combine in their scholastic preparation. It seems to me that the establishment of
an advanced school of psychology and counseling would be a slight departure
from Fuller's educational thrust thus far in that then we would be training full­
time counselors as well as men who use counseling in their ministry. Whereas at
present it is a tool in the ministry of the gospel, for some, counseling and ther­
apy would become the end. Of course, our objective is to make men whole--in
Christ. But I believe this would nonetheless, be a slight departure from our
training program thus far and into preparation for full-time therapy, be closer to
the medical and psychological professions. But who can say that this would be
bad or not the Lord's will for Fuller?

I do have difficulty in justifying an advanced school of psychology and
counseling before a school of missions is established. Missions, I believe, is
much more central to the main objective and purpose of our school since its
founding. Didn't the vision God gave for the founding of our school include a
strong emphasis on missions and missionary preparation?

But what about the financial opportunity we have now to establish a school
of psychology and counseling? The fact that we have been offered considerable
financial assistance to do something doesn't necessarily prove it is God's will to do it. It may be, or it may not be.

I am a little bit leery of and question if it is the Lord's leading to set up a school of psychology and counseling—strongly emphasizing a discipline that has hitherto been supportive and ancillary—until a school much more central to the basic thrust and goal of our school has been established. We must keep our priorities as they should be and stay in the proper balance.

Guy James

ON THE SEMINARY CALENDAR

Since many of our student body are planning to take summer school work on various campuses across the country, I am wondering if our administration is aware of a very binding situation. Most of these summer school sessions begin the week of June 10th; yet our spring quarter is not terminated until June 14th. In checking catalogues of several other seminaries I found their closing date two or three weeks earlier than Fuller, this even in light of the fact that they all begin classes approximately the same time in the Fall as Fuller.

I would hope the seminary will take this into consideration for the coming year. Yes, I am one of the students in this bind.

Joel Stolte

Letters, in order to be published, must be signed. Although the opinion welcomes all viewpoints on all issues, we ask that letters be as brief as possible. the opinion reserves the right to edit all letters submitted.

For members of the 'Jet Set' who will be attending pre-exam parties the following topics are listed as being "in:"
1. The new President-elect
2. The graduate School of Psychology
3. The color of the Library doors
4. The objet d'arts in the quadrangle
5. Charismatic Gifts
6. Missions at Fuller
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