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STUDENTS RESPOND TO FACULTY FORUM

Aside from the Chapel being unbearably stuffy due to inadequate ventilation, several things stand out in my mind concerning the recent Faculty Forum.

Commonly discussed among students is the lack of familiarity on the part of the faculty with each other's views. I felt that the forum, in a token manner, helped alleviate this lack of communication. Along this same line, there was needed more discussion among the panel members when particular questions were raised from the audience. A question coming from the audience was usually directed to one member and dropped after one response.

Although there had been some preparation, I felt there could have been more. The general tone of the Forum gave me the impression of being almost "off the cuff." Perhaps this weakness reflects a lack of planning as illustrated by the fact that the whole thing came off on rather short notice. Furthermore, there would have been more student participation if the Forum would have been conducted earlier in the quarter.

KEITH PIPER

The recent forum on the Missouri Synod Study Document on Revelation, Inspiration, and Inerrancy I found to be quite revealing and valuable. To the faculty members participating I extend my sincere thanks, for this was not an easy problem of theology to discuss. However, unless this is considered as only the beginning of a series of dialogue on the problems of scripture, the value of the recent forum will greatly diminish.

As a student I am now more confused than before concerning the meaning of inerrancy of scripture; each man appeared to define inerrancy according to his own theological presuppositions. This is not necessarily improper, for it was pointed out that the word "inerrancy" is a theological term and therefore its definition can only be determined by theologians.

Therefore I propose that the faculty prepare a study paper, similar to the one discussed at the forum, with the purpose of defining more clearly what the various definitions of inerrancy are and how this relates to one's total view of scripture and revelation. This paper might then be either discussed in an elective course or possibly at another open forum. Dialogue has begun and this is valuable; but it must continue if it is to remain dialogue.

RALPH WRIGHT

The editors of the opinion solicited these reactions to the Faculty Forum on the Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) Report on "Revelation, Inspiration, and Inerrancy." Representative students from each class were contacted.
EDITORIAL

FREEDOM TO PROBE

Freedom belongs to the educational process. Fuller Seminary from its earliest moments has been faithful to this proposition. From time to time we do well to remind ourselves of this truth. As we attempt to understand the implications of redemptive history and the pronouncements of theologians, we must not drift into a stagnant pool of dogmatism. Our human comprehension of truth is limited by our finite character. Therefore, even theological truth is known only in part. The core of academic freedom is found in its relentless quest for understanding and its complete adherence to truth.

The purpose of academic freedom is twofold. First, the faculty must be free to accept and to teach concepts which differ from other faculty members in matters not essential to our most basic Christian faith. This Fuller Seminary has consistently affirmed as a faculty freedom. Second, the student must interact with those theological and practical issues which bear upon his understanding of his own faith. He must struggle with the nature of the Scripture record as well as with critical theology. The freedom to have differences of opinion constitutes the climate in which learning can best take place.

All too often well-meaning Christians have been suspicious of any school which adheres to the principle of academic freedom. Regrettably their suspicion has been justified, for in the theological world academic liberty has turned to license. But an integral tenet of academic freedom is responsibility. In the realm of the theological search, this signifies a faith commitment. Honest and sincere thinking founded upon such a depth experience cannot betray the heart of our Christian faith.

Fuller Seminary, holding to the concept of academic freedom, must not be swayed by the invisible "they." However, this is not a call to unrestrained license and religious experimentation. Fuller has a responsibility to minister faithfully to the Christian Church. This responsibility demands empathy with the Church's occasional misunderstanding. We must therefore, continually engage in discussion to the end that theological truth may be ascertained.

For this reason, students have generally welcomed recent developments at Fuller. Issues which were previously discussed only behind closed doors were brought into the arena of intraseminary debate. Although this step was cautiously taken, it represents a great advancement in the definition and solution of one of our problems. The opinion has been an avenue of expression for student reactions. In accord with the basic policy of this paper all bore the author's signature. Furthermore, it is our policy to publish any mature presentation by the students regardless of whether or not we agree with its conclusion. This acts as a stimulus to dialogue. Finally, we depend upon the reader to critically analyze the merit of the various ideas presented. In conclusion the opinion intends to freely and responsibly probe issues which arise in the context of our theological training.
One thing the recent faculty forum seemed to make clear is that the issues at hand are not clear. Dr. Wallace's assertion that Scripture does not hold us to inerrancy raised what in fact was the pivotal point of the whole discussion: What are the implications of theopneustos (2 Tim. 3:16)? If God is ultimately the author of Scripture, do we not impugn God's character by admitting error? Dr. Wallace erred in passing this off as a "logical" and therefore irrelevant argument. The process of drawing inferences from otherwise inexplicit data is basic to all scholarship. The question must be dealt with at the level of its premise.

While the forum did not succeed in settling issues (such was not expected of it), it did succeed in revealing the various points of view which are blowing in the evangelical wind. They run the gamut from a strictly orthodox formulation, through cautious moderation, to a view which does not hold to inerrancy as necessary. Time will tell which survives.

DALE GERARD

Thank you, faculty, for your straightforward openness at the recent faculty forum. The air has been cleared of much misconstrued hearsay. Yet there was by no means unanimity between the panel and the floor regarding inerrancy (nor amongst panel members?). But this is no time for irresponsible students to pit one professor against another. The critics outside our walls are having a one-sided game at this. As responsible men, convinced it is God's Word we are handling, let us not merely be dilettante dabbler in this discussion. I suggest, first of all, that we find out what the Scriptures say about inerrancy, inspiration, and revelation, and second, that we carefully weigh what theologians have said and are saying about this perplexing doctrine. For it is the doctrine of Scripture we will be called to defend and re-define to our contemporaries. Let us be able to defend with conviction based on knowledge and understanding.

E. PAUL BALISKY

In the faculty forum the three men from Fuller left me with a profound frustration because they dodged issues and, it seemed to me, purposely misunderstood certain questions so that they could give their pat answers. I am not evaluating the men on their theological positions but on the soundness of their arguments and their openminded willingness to deal honestly with the questions in hand. I was disappointed that Dr. Wallace did not speak more often for I feel he had a lot to offer. What was the purpose, to defend a position? or to seek truth? Let us always seek for truth no matter where it may take us!

BRUCE E. CRAPUCHETTES

The recent panel which dealt with the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod statement on Scripture had the advantage of dealing with a concrete discussion of the problem, which happily gave the evening a stability.

I was especially taken up with the thought that ad infinitum haranguing over an inerrant autographa can be irrelevant: we have only the (corrupt) text which is before us, and it is this text with which we must work. It is in-
correct to state that the Bible is 1. inerrant, and 2. therefore our final authority in matters of faith and practice. It is preferable to state that 1. the Bible is firstly our authority, and 2. one secondary aspect of that authority is inerrancy. Only then is it properly queried, What do we mean by inerrancy?

It struck me that many present did not prefer our seminary's present statement. And I was pleased with the belief that there should be a freedom of interpretation of that statement.

Certainly it was an evening well spent. This leads me to believe that we might have other forums, and other questions could be discussed, e.g. the Church, the Sacraments, the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.

DARRYL FREELAND

Inerrancy is a Biblically based "doctrine" just as important as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and it was defended as such by three Fuller professors on Tuesday evening. One believed it was true because the Church taught it; another believed it by making a "leap of faith", and the third, honestly thought the Scriptures are inerrant. They left unanswered the main question of the students--do the Scriptures claim inerrancy? If not, why should it be a part of our creed? I for one, hoped for a more complete answer than the hedging we received. Dr. Wallace should be commended for the honesty he tried to bring to the discussion.

DICRAN ARAM BERBERIAN

The success or failure of the forum on inspiration depends on your perspective. Some came with high hopes of seeing an issue thoroughly dissected; they went away unhappy. Others expected to see their particular views on the subject brilliantly defended by one or more of the panel members; they were also unsatisfied. Perhaps many expected too much from an hour and a half of discussion.

I thought the forum was a success. Not because of what went on inside the chapel, but because of what I saw taking place outside. For the first time in my memory almost everyone was interested in a theological issue. For a few days it was not hard to find dialogue on a relevant theme.

We all realize that there are other things in life besides points of doctrine; however, let us not forget that free discussion stimulates learning. If faculty forums can stimulate the student body as a whole to discuss theology with a mind to relating it to life, then I'm in favor of more faculty forums.

JAY PARIS

The recent forum on revelation, inspiration, and inerrancy was, to say the least, disappointing. Not only did the panel members seem disinterested themselves, but when confronted with challenging questions, they passed them off with a joke or wry comment. One bright spot, however, was Dr. Wallace, who found himself unable to get any real response from the other panelists when he touched on several pungent issues. His statement questioning the
place of inerrancy in a confessional was well taken. It seems that he, as well as most other evangelicals, would just as soon see this debate drop from its place of primacy in conservative circles.

To repeat--the failure of the panelists to rise to well placed questions was the most frustrating point of a pointless evening.

DAVID G. DOUGHERTY

Being somewhat of a novice in this world of theological debate and discussion it would be somewhat hypocritical to comment on the validity of statements made during the recent panel discussion on revelation, inspiration, and inerrancy. However, I did have a few general opinions I would like to share concerning the merit of the panel discussion.

Much to the disappointment of the student body this was not a debate. Nevertheless, I felt there was an attempt to communicate to the public the conservative position of Fuller on inspiration, etc. Disappointing as this may be to a critical-minded student body, I felt this panel was well conducted and did have some value here. I am sorry so much "precious time" had to be spent redefining the issues at stake, and I was glad someone finally brought the situation home to the real question at Fuller. Realizing semantic problems leave an escape for those involved in this critical area, I wish there was some way of coming to a better understanding of what we really do believe at Fuller. Or are we afraid to find out? If so why do we have to continue hiding behind a pretense?

STANLEY SCHRA

OF CREEDS AND MEN

"We believe that the Bible is the divinely inspired word of God and that it is, therefore, the final authority in matters of faith and practice" Calif. Baptist Sem.

"We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible." Conservative Baptist Theological Sem., Denver.

"The Bible, including both the Old and New Testaments, is a divine revelation, the original autographs of which were verbally inspired by the Holy Spirit." Moody Bible Institute.

"We believe that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God', by which we understand the whole Bible is inspired in the sense that holy men of God 'were moved by the Holy Spirit' to write the very words of Scripture. We believe that this divine inspiration extends equally and fully to all parts of the writings - historical, poetical, doctrinal and prophetical - as appeared in the original manuscripts." Dallas Theological Seminary.

"We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as verbally inspired by God and inerrant in the original writing, and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life." Wheaton College.

"The books which form the canon of the Old and New Testaments as originally given are plenarily inspired and free from all error in the whole and in the part. These books constitute the written Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." Fuller Theological Seminary.

(No statement on the Scripture is given in the catalogues of either Union Theological Seminary, New York or the School of Theology at Claremont).
As a rapid glance at the above will show, Fuller has the distinction of having one of the strongest statements on the inerrancy of the Scriptures. The average reader of our creed doubtlessly understands the Scriptures' inerrancy to include historical and geographical details, chronological and numerical accuracy, as well as any grammatical or linguistic minutiae.

The question about our staunchly orthodox creed is this - Is it myth or is it reality? To see the Scriptures' infallibility in terms of its ultimate spiritual purpose and harmony seems to require that we demythologize our creed. To find our inerrant texts in the faraway and untraceable autographs may be a truly impregnable position, but partakes of the nature of a flight from reality (i.e. from the Biblical text that we do have before us). Finally, to interpret the meaning of our creed in any other than the straight forward, obvious way in which our constituency surely reads it, seems to be engaging in some sort of scholastic subtleties, if not downright dishonesty.

The fact of the matter is that it is through the Bible that we now possess that God speaks to us, not through an inerrant, untraceable original. Personally I prefer to hear God speak through an instrument that partakes of human frailties (our God delights to do just this - to speak His Word of Power through human frailty) than to behold a silent God locked in an inerrant, perfectly logical Scriptural system. I have observed that watertight systems, "logical" to the last detailed minutiae have a tendency to become asphyxiating!

Another danger for one who must find a completely inerrant system, is that the person tends to be continually on the defensive - one little proven error will fell his God and bring Him tumbling to the earth! Hence there arises the inevitable tendency to manipulate the data, in order that at all costs we may continue to assert an errorless Scripture. It seems the height of folly to place oneself in such an inextricable dilemma. (To flee to an inerrant, undiscoverable "original" seems to me to be not a solution, but a dishonorable retreat.) Surely our God is greater than a faded ink marking on an aged scroll that lies helpless before the finite mind of men!

Consider for a moment the example of the apostles. It is a most remarkable thing that they did not major in emphasizing the Scriptures' inerrancy, but were overmastered by its authority in their lives. Could our concern to find security in an error-free system of Scripture be an evidence that we have lost the authority of God at work among us? I suspect that to the school which holds to the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, the apostles must seem to be rather "free-wheeling" in their treatment of Scripture. They altered the wording if it suited their purposes, inserted portions and deleted portions and often ruthlessly extracted a passage from its context to prove, illustrate or support their point. A question we ought to ask afresh is, 'What was the apostles' attitude to Scripture?'

At the recent panel on this subject, it seemed that the invisible eyes of our constituency were continually upon us. The result was stifling to free and open discussion. As a result of this panel discussion, it appears to me that since the Scripture does not explicitly teach the necessity of its own inerrancy and the Biblical text which we now have does not support any such conclusion, our Creed is too strongly worded in its statement on inerrancy.
P.S. I believe that the canonical Scriptures are the reliable and authoritative Word from God, infallible in their purpose, which is to bring men into a relationship with God through Christ, and to enlighten them concerning His will in Christ.

ÉRIC SCHILLER

*****

THE PROBLEM WITH CREEDS

by John W. Slayton

John Q. Christian has contributed a great deal more to civilization than he is generally given credit for. Engaged for nearly 2,000 years in a narrow-minded pursuit of one object, he has incidentally given a hundred new ideas to his pagan neighbors. One of his crowning achievements has been the establishment of the so-called "grammatico-historical method."

Only a few incipient nihilists remain to deny totally the validity of the technique. To those who take objective revelation seriously, this is a point of departure for Biblical studies.

A man sits down to write a story. He sets forth words with a generally understood meaning and order. This is grammar. He also writes in terms of events that he has known or experienced. This is history. If we know both his history and his language, then we can understand anything that he has written. We assume that he can write intelligibly.

The grammatico-historical method thus aims to discover what the author means by what he writes. The Bible is a special problem. By its own testimony, the writers themselves do not always understand the meaning of what they write. The method falls down at this point. But it is well to note - the Bible is a special case. It is the rule and the exception, rolled into one. Once we can apply the grammatico-historical method to scripture, we find we have a technique which will apply without exception to all uninspired writings.

Now we've got a good thing here. The grammatico-historical method, developed for Biblical studies should be extended to other areas. I would like to mention two of these.

We are all aware of the debate that is going on over the place of the judiciary in our government. What it boils down to is that, while court X has a body of law to interpret, it has lost the basis for interpretation. Do you not remember being taught in grade school that the courts of the land "reinterpret" the constitution to fit the changing times? If you do not, you surely must be aware that this is the present practice.

A law in this country is a rule formulated by a specific body of men. These men when they made the law had one idea in their minds, which they expressed in the words on the paper. It is this idea which is the law.

JOHN SLAYTON received his B.A. from Simpson Bible College in 1961. He is presently a senior at FTS.
The idea can usually be found by grammatical and historical interpretation of the document. The words and their organization had a specific meaning to the authors. To reinterpret is to change this meaning. But changing the meaning is changing the law. It is obvious that through reinterpreting the law, our supreme court is indeed making new legislation, and thus usurping the powers of Congress. The courts should interpret grammatically and historically.

There is one other area in which this method of interpretation should be applied.

Church creeds are a problem. Those of us who are from non-creedal churches do, it is true, lack a certain familiarity with the problem. But then again, we see better from a distance. In the last part of the last century, men of sub-Christian belief infiltrated many of the old-line denominations. They signed the creeds and they gave assent to the doctrines of the church. They used the very words laid down by the church councils, but they reinterpreted those words. They did not mean by them what the councils meant by them. Machen wrote an entire book, Christianity and Liberalism, to point out this basic dishonesty.

Now there should be no problem here. The words of a creed represent an idea in the minds of its formulators. By interpreting the creed grammatically and historically we can arrive at that idea. But when the Liberals quoted the creed in saying that Jesus was the "Son of God," they refused to use the grammatico-historical method to find the meaning of "Son of God." Instead, they made up their own meaning. This was dishonest. They were liars, and they infiltrated churches and seminaries and mission boards. Then they captured them.

As evangelical Christians we all recognize this. But we are often puzzled as to how we shall handle our own creedal statements. The answer is simple - interpret them grammatically and historically, and if you cannot live with this interpretation, go somewhere else.

At this point someone will doubtless interject a question, "But shouldn't we follow the spirit of the creed?" Precisely. Yet there is often an erroneous assumption implicit in this question. This is that the spirit of all creeds is alike. Now this is patently absurd. Some creeds were written in a very dogmatic spirit. Others were an attempt to be as tolerant as possible. Not a few were polemic in nature. Once we realize this, we are forced to answer the question, "What is the spirit of my particular creed?" And we immediately see the error involved in attempting to stand up and put forth general statements about how to use a creed, how to change it, etc., without having some specific creed in mind. You may be able to interpret your church's creed very freely, but that doesn't mean that I will be able to do the same with my church's creed.

We have seen that I must interpret this creed grammatically and historically. But now how shall I discover the spirit of the creed? The answer itself must be arrived at by grammatical and historical analysis. And it is quite plain in nature. I can apply the creed only as loosely as its framers intended it to be applied. If my knowledge of the men involved shows that they intended the creed to be applied rigidly, and if this is the outlook of the constituency of the supporting organization, then this is a part of the interpretation of the creed. I can not give verbal assent, apply it loosely, and remain honest.
Restrict institutional change? Some rigidly applied creeds were intended to. Loosely applied creeds allow more flexibility to begin with. It is frequently possible, especially in new organizations, to tell which type of creed we are dealing with - simply by the use of the grammatico-historical method. And obviously this reveals the spirit of the creed.

Discovering the spirit of a creed is often difficult. But there is one contingency concerning which, I fear, we must be dogmatic. If a creed was directed against a certain doctrine, then to admit that particular doctrine is to violate both the letter, and the spirit of the creed.

The old-line denominations and seminaries were cut off from Christianity by infiltration, an infiltration which took place through a basic dishonesty which refused to apply the grammatico-historical method to find both the interpretation and the spirit of the creeds. And as one of the infiltrators once remarked to one of our own Professors, "You (conservatives) are too damn honest."

We were on the side of truth, and we still are. And we are recapturing the churches for Jesus Christ. But we are in danger of falling into the same basic dishonesty which once justified liberal infiltration. Come on now, we know how to find the meaning and spirit behind a creed. Shall we do evil that good may come?

*****

THE RIGHTS' METHOD AND DR. LITTLE

by Eric G. Lemmon

"The racial revolution has issued a challenge to ministers to sound the call for love - a love that flows not only from white to black, but from black to white. Without fear or favor, without glib answers or private prejudices should we not remind society that the avid integrationist and the rigid segregationist are both sinners under judgment and men for whom Christ died?"

(Dr. David A. Hubbard, "Is The Ministry Keeping Pace?")

It is in this spirit that this article is intended.

When I first read the lead article in the last issue of the opinion, my reaction was to write an article in defense of property rights per se. However, an adequate presentation would be beyond the scope of an article of the length appropriate for the opinion. Instead, I will only attempt to comment on various points made by Dr. Little. I would also recommend very highly the new book by Dr. Gottfried Dietze, political science professor at Johns Hopkins University, In Defense of Property, (Regnery), in which he admirably presents a well-reasoned discussion of the nature of property, its history, its attendant rights, and its abuses - this against a background of personal experience in the abuse of property during the Hitler era.

The first observation I should like to make is that Dr. Little slips in his discussion of grace and law rather freely from the Scriptural references

ERIC G. LEMMON received his BA from The University of Arizona in 1963. He is presently a Junior at PTS.
dealing with the nature of Christian conduct relative to civil law and those dealing with obedience to the Law of God, (c.f. Romans 13:1-7 and Romans 13:8-14), without making the distinctions that the passages make. I do not understand how these and other references suggest that "grace fulfills the Law of God by passing laws which alone protect and preserve just relationships among men," (Dr. Little's emphasis). It appears to me, rather, that these portions teach that the law of God is fulfilled in believers when they are obedient to the laws of the state and recognize that God has allowed these authorities to administrate the civil affairs of life. (I have not yet questioned Dr. Little's position, but have raised questions as to his use of the statements of his text.)

Paraphrased, the central thesis of Dr. Little's discussion is that love, working no ill to its neighbor, by grace recognizes and protects, by passing legislation, man's "equal rights," one of which is unquestionably the right to acquire property.

Let me suggest that Dr. Little's contentions appear to center around two suppositions, i.e. that equal rights and equal opportunity are one and the same, and that moral law for the individual is equivalent to the laws that should be passed for the State.

Please consider the proposition that to have equal opportunity is not to have equal rights and that these two, rights and opportunities, interact to mitigate one another. For example, if I have something to sell and am asking 25¢ for it, your right to buy is directly conditioned by your possessing 25¢, i.e. my requirement for purchase. The argument may seem moot on the grounds that the law of the seller is not one of race, color, or religion, but of economics. However, consider the logic involved: If an individual has the right to buy property (not necessarily mine), it is directly conditioned by my right to offer my property for sale and to set a price upon it. The issue is similar in the nature of other restrictions I may care to set. Should I decide that I want only blue-eyed people to buy a pet cat, the inference of an argument on color discrimination would not permit me to select a buyer on this basis. (Change the prospective buyer to white or a colored person and the analogy becomes the current issue.) Regardless of how ill-considered or puerile my reasons, I submit that I should be able to refuse to sell my cat to anyone on whatever grounds may appear important to me. Dr. Little makes much of the fact that the equal right of acquisition is "never" talked about. I submit that it in practice exists and therefore elicits little comment. Anyone has the right to acquire property on the equal basis that the seller makes the terms of the sale (either with or without consultation with the prospective buyer). If I meet his requirements, my equal right to buy has come abreast of my opportunity to buy, since I have met the seller's conditions, and I make my purchase. We may or may not personally agree with the seller that the criteria for sale are just or reasonable, say race or color or religion, but that equal rights have been violated is a spurious contention. By the same logic I could force an individual to buy on the grounds that his reasons for not buying were discriminatory. By the way, I know of two instances involving the purchase of property for religious purposes (by a second transaction) by individuals in which they were refused on the basis of religion. One involved the purchase by an individual of a house adjacent to a very large Baptist Church as a gift for that church. The owner, a devout Roman Catholic refused, and insists that the property is not and never will be for sale to any protestant, especially a member of the neighboring church. On the other hand, a church in a smaller community refused to sell a piece of distant property to an individual, a member of the Jehovah's Witness sect, on similar grounds:
his intending to use it for religious purposes. Dr. Little says, "My freedom to sell is being conditioned by your right to buy." I would suggest that I have no right to buy, unless he chooses to sell and I meet his conditions.

Secondly, Dr. Little indicates that civil law should be equated with the standards for personal, moral and ethical conduct and intent. This, in my opinion, is neither the teaching of Scripture nor the precedent of history, particularly American democracy, i.e. republicanism. Jesus taught that to think adulterous thoughts was in essence to commit the act. If Dr. Little's thesis is correct, then we must pass laws to control the thinking of licentious thoughts (we all recognize that even God has not restricted these activities except by our consent to His law). Are we prepared to do this? On the other hand, who would deny that the morality of Jesus' teaching should be binding on every individual. Where civil laws can enforce common decency and morality they are good and proper, but where they legislate upon the conscience of the individual regarding his choices or prejudices which cause his discrimination, they are beyond their proper and reasonable scope and are oppressive, curtailing liberty, freedom of conscience, and in some cases freedom of religion. (Dr. Little makes a distinction between prejudice and discrimination: we feel that one is coterminus with the other.)

In this regard, Dr. Little, quoting the fourteenth amendment of our Constitution, emphasizes that the law "gets a crack" at our freedoms by stating that "...no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." What Dr. Little does not say is that due process of law comes only after one has indebted his life, liberty, or property beyond redemption, by malfeasance. If I commit murder, I have forfeited my right to life. If I commit another crime, I may forfeit my right to liberty. If I indebt myself economically, I have already mortgaged my property by virtue of debt, and it may be confiscated for payment. The law "gets its crack" at my freedoms only when I have allowed it, wittingly or otherwise, to do so.

Beyond this, Dr. Little repeatedly insists that, "Civil rights cannot be and will not be enforced without an adequate body of law, of new law, of clarifying law, of law which repeals antecedent discriminatory law, a law which restricts the freedom of prejudice so to discriminate under the law." We disagree and suggest that unrighteous treatment of individuals or groups on any basis, whether color or some other, will not be effectively dealt with until men's hearts or at least their minds, are changed, and they are constrained spiritually into the "love that works no evil to its neighbor." (The quotation from Dr. Hubbard used at the beginning of this article is particularly relevant here.)

Dr. Little also says referring to Public Accommodations legislation, that "The ground for such discrimination is always 'economic', always." Such sweeping statements are abundant in his discussion and indicate that Dr. Little does not recognize the large contingent of persons in this country who, right or wrong, none the less hold to the "separate but equal" doctrine, the law of the land for so many years, on the basis of conviction and moral and ethical persuasion.

Again, Dr. Little says that communities like Covina are tragic situations, i.e. ipso facto all-white neighborhoods are bad; only integrated communities are good. Integration for the sake of integration is commendable in and of itself. Dr. Little's suggestion? Only law will remedy and reverse the situation. We disagree again. Only individual respect for individuals, colored or white, without forced priority for minorities will improve whatever may need improvement, and that permanently.
Finally, let me make it clear that this is neither a defense of segregation nor an argument for integration. It is rather an attempt to indicate a point of view as to the methodology of accomplishing ethical civil adjustment. We are inclined to think that one must be "either/or" on these issues. I, personally, could readily participate in and encourage movements to challenge our people to attitudes commensurate with Dr. Little's text (Romans 13:10), especially on behalf of our colored friends. On the other hand, I would not and could not, with the same clearness of conscience, be able to endorse forced association or legislated priority for any race, white or colored. To insist, for example, that ten per cent of a population in a factory must be white is to discriminate against ten per cent of the colored population who for one reason or another might have had these jobs. This is priority of opportunity, not equality of opportunity. I could not vote for or help a bill which would coerce a property owner to sell by limiting his prerogative to set the terms of sale. If he likes, he may discriminate against me. I may not like it, but I cherish for him the right to do it.

The alternative to legislation and coercion is a massive spiritual assault on the minds and hearts of our people, that we might learn to treat one another as the equal members of God's creation and allow each man to stand on what he is rather than on the color of the skin that God has given him. The battle is one of the spirit and must be dealt with on that level. To resort to mob anarchy and the rule of force is to jeopardize our integral freedom as moral agents and someday, should the preponderance of sentiment shift in religious issues, e.g. to a totally atheistic philosophy, we may find ourselves unable to proclaim freely the rectitudes of the Gospel by reason of the same coercion which many of our numbers are now advocating. We might well note that the Lord Jesus did not resort to mobs rioting in the street nor to civil law for the proclamation of the Gospel and the furtherance of His Kingdom.

*****

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: DROWNING

Looking forward with hopeful anticipation to the new "Core" curriculum with its increased emphasis on learning through reading, I was caught by the raw datum that 5000 volumes are to be added to the library each year. How can I chart a purposeful course through this sea without drowning?

Here my mind turned to the faculty with the thought they might gain a jump on the new curriculum by starting now to work up an annotated bibliography for each course offered and other related interests. By annotation I mean the inclusion of such items as the nature of the material covered by the book, the questions or problems to which the author addresses himself, the general doctrinal position the author assumes and the depth and comprehensiveness of the work. While this may be a life raft for some, it will be a lighthouse for others.

Richard A. Schroeder

---
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