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STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF SOCIAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Convinced that the teachings of Jesus our Lord include definite principles that demand a social concern on the part of the Christian Church, interested students at Fuller Seminary have met and organized the Social Action Committee. Though the committee does not speak officially for the seminary, it seeks to implement the policy on social action as stated in the catalog:

The seminary believes that the hour has come when the church must apply the gospel to the real world that all men may enjoy equal fellowship in the church as well as equal justice in society.

The latent belief that the Church as a whole has failed to recognize its responsibility to be concerned with and involved in social issues has forced its way to the surface of our consciences. It is no longer possible to ignore the injustices we see being administered to our fellow men. We must rise to the occasion by acting in a positive manner. Too long the evangelical wing of the Church has remained inattentive to the cries for help that have come from the needy, the outcast and the victims of the prejudices of many of our countrymen.

It is definitely understood that all that is attempted will be done on a sound theological basis. There is no thought of weakening the emphasis of bringing lost men to a personal faith in Christ. Indeed we hope that those helped through our interest and concern will recognize a Divine love being expressed in concrete terms and respond in a positive way to the original source of this love. It must be added, however, that we do not believe we should limit our activities to those areas where we feel a faith response is most likely. We cannot restrict the avenues through which God may reveal His grace and express His love.

One of the chief ways to achieve understanding of the issues is active participation in the group. We seriously urge students of all points of view to attend any and all public meetings sponsored by the committee in order that meaningful exploration of the issues can take place. By so doing, we will learn from one another and see the problems more clearly. So join us as we interact with the issues and meet with men acquainted with all aspects of the social problems that concern us. Together we may be able to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church of Jesus Christ and achieve some positive gains to His honor and glory.

It is to be hoped that we will contribute to worthy causes as a seminary family and that men will go from this seminary with an understanding of the relevant social issues and with positive convictions as to what the Church can do to alleviate social injustices.

Roy Brewer
Social Action Committee

This statement of purpose will be presented to the Social Action Committee for their consideration today.
EDITORIAL

ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

For the first time in seventeen years the stated concern of Fuller in social areas has become actualized. Under the prodding of President Hubbard, the Inner City Conference, and the Student Council, a social concern which has culminated in the formation of the Social Action Committee has developed among the students at Fuller.

the opinion recognizes that most students are disturbed about the lethargy of the Christian Church in ministering the whole gospel. We have also noted a lack of knowledge of what is involved in taking action to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, we strongly urge everyone at Fuller to participate in all available opportunities to gain this knowledge. It is hoped that the newly formed Social Action Committee will responsibly direct our study of what it means for the Church of Jesus Christ to "apply the gospel to the real world which surrounds us." Thus we shall understand how we as Christians can "see to it that all men--red, yellow, black, and white--enjoy equal fellowship in the church as well as equal justice in society."

THE EDITORS

POLITICS ON THE CAMPUS: GOLDWATER VS. ROCKEFELLER

WHY I AM FOR BARRY GOLDWATER  
by Charles Fishburne

In a recent college journal it was stated that today's true liberal is the "conservative" - for historically a "liberal" was one who believed in individual liberty with minimal interference from a limited government. Yet today that philosophy is espoused by the new conservatism, whereas modern liberalism would encroach upon our individual freedoms by a burgeoning federal bureaucracy!

Senator Barry Goldwater, the leader of the new conservatism, is likely to be nominated by the Republican party for the Presidency. In the limited space allotted, I have chosen to discuss the three main issues on which he won my support: defense, muzzling of the military, and the cold war. A brief discussion of civil rights is also relevant.

National Defense. During the Berlin crisis in 1961, some alarm was expressed in Washington over the combat readiness of our forces in Europe. So General Decker, then Chief of Staff, came over to "inspect" by observing a NATO maneuver and meeting with several generals. The maneuver was an attack by a French-American force of two tank companies and four infantry companies. I commanded the American tank company. We were given a full week's notice. Since only nine out of seventeen tanks were running, we had to borrow some. But since no other company in the battalion had even eight (out of seventeen) running, we had to combine three companies just to field one complete company! We practiced the attack four times in two days. On the third day we put on our "realistic" maneuver for General Decker. A week later I read that he had lauded our combat readiness before a Senate Sub-Committee. I did not know whether to laugh or cry....

Charles Fishburne is a Middler at F.T.S. He received his B.A. from Wheaton College in 1959. He has served as a Lieutenant in the U.S. Army in Germany.
This was not an isolated instance. I had contact with many officers all over Germany, and found this to be the general rule. Ever since my Army experiences I have been prone to believe those who question our national defense posture rather than those who blandly assure the public of our military strength and reliability.

Muzzling of the Military. At his commander's request, an officer friend set up and anti-communist indoctrination program for his unit of 1500 troops. He used no Birch material. On one occasion, the film "Operation Abolition," prepared by a Congressional committee, was shown to the officers on post. A short time later my friend and his colonel were personally ordered by the Commanding General of the 7th Army to abolish all anti-communist indoctrination. About three months later, we read the testimony of Pentagon officials that there was no muzzling of the military....In an article in the Saturday Evening Post, Senator Goldwater said: "The real danger to our country...does not come from military commanders...who want to make sure their troops are informed of the true nature of our enemy, but from forces which would deny such instruction."

What about civil rights? No responsible and honest Christian can support discrimination. My personal desire is to see the Negro given equal opportunity to earn self-respect, and I was concerned about charges that Goldwater was a segregationist. So I personally investigated. This is what I found. On April 15, 1964, I personally heard Goldwater make the unequivocal statement, "I am against segregation, discrimination, and racial hatred."

Consider Goldwater's personal record. As a member of the Phoenix City Council, Goldwater the politician voted to desegregate the restaurant at Sky Harbor Airport. As chief of staff of the Arizona Air National Guard, Goldwater the soldier ordered the end of segregation in the guard. In 1951-52, Goldwater the private citizen donated $400 of his own money to the local Phoenix NAACP in an effort to speed integration of the public schools. He is to this day a member of the Urban League.

What is his personal stand on civil rights? Let him speak for himself, in Conscience of a Conservative: "It so happens that I am in agreement with the objectives of the Supreme Court as stated in the Brown decision. I believe that it is both wise and just for Negro children to attend the same schools as whites, and that to deny them this opportunity carries with it strong implications of inferiority. I believe that the problem of race relations, like all social and cultural changes, however desirable, should not be effected by the engines of national power. Let us, through persuasion and education, seek to improve institutions we deem defective. But let us, in doing so, respect the orderly processes of the law. Any other course enthrones tyrants and dooms freedom."

Is that racism? Or is it respect for both law and liberty?

Edward Banks, the Negro publisher of the Arizona Tribune, said recently: "Goldwater is basically a liberal when it comes to civil and human rights. He has done a great deal for Negro integration in Arizona and he should be judged on that record. Arizona is one of the most liberal states in these United States when it comes to race relations, and Goldwater's influence has been a major factor. He has done more for Arizona Negroes than any other Arizona politician."

Goldwater believes that excessive federal legislation will only lead to restriction and a resultant bitter reaction that would set the cause of the Negro back for decades. At the Spring Banquet, Dr. Englund wisely urged the clergy to educate and integrate the churches, for by integration of the church the problem of discrimination will be largely solved. Goldwater would exert moral pressure in that direction. This is a slower path, but a surer one.
It is his opponents who have unfairly depicted him as a segregationist - an irresponsible charge made by Pat Brown during the 1963 Governor's Conference.

The Cold War. My German friends assessed our foreign policy as that of "politische Kinder." I was told: "You try to buy friendship rather than earn respect. When you assert your power and leadership the rest of the world will follow; but not until."

On August 13, 1961, an ugly wall was begun in Berlin. We rushed tanks and troops up to the wall. Then, right under the noses of our silent guns, the Communists kept right on building - while to the east they were laughing - until the wall was erected. It still stands - a monument to weakness and appeasement. We had been made the laughingstock of the world. Small wonder Castro does not fear to flaunt his fist in our face!

In the Post article I have mentioned, Goldwater said: "It is the (liberals) in our midst who rigorously oppose any use of force, or any show of strength in a conflict where our antagonist understands only the element of power." At this point some, following the noble example of Bertrand Russell, cower before the atom bomb: "I'd rather crawl on my knees to Moscow than die from an atom bomb." Would I rather die instantly, from a nuclear blast, or would it be better to languish on a muddy battlefield, my stomach ripped open by shrapnel, until the mercies of death ended my mortal agony? I thank God that in our country's inception there were men of courage, men who would not "rather crawl to London on my knees than be impaled on a British bayonet," men who counted life not worthy the price of tyranny, and who counted liberty well worth the cost of life.

But I agree with Goldwater (and my German friends) that we do not have to fight a hot war to win the cold one. Hear Senator Goldwater: "Our avowed national objective is 'peace'. We have, with great sincerity, waged peace, while the Communists wage war. We have sought 'settlements' while the Communists seek victories. We have tried to pacify the world. The Communists mean to own it.... We want a peace in which freedom and justice will prevail, and that...is a peace which must follow victory over Communism. If we maintain our strength, we need never go to war because we're the most powerful nation on earth."

I am for Barry Goldwater because he best exemplifies that nobility and courage expressed that day our country was plunged into the birth-pangs of freedom: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!"

WHY I AM FOR NELSON ROCKEFELLER by Ralph Wright

The Republican Party today stands at a crossroad which threatens its very existence. The two roads down which the party can choose to travel simply named are the Progressive Road and the Reactionary Road. In other words, will the party continue in the progressive tradition of Lincoln, Dewey, and Eisenhower, or will it revert into a status quo, ultra conservative party supported by a minority of heterogeneous America?

The two men which best personify the two diverse philosophies are Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Senator Barry Goldwater. On June 2, the Republicans of California will have the opportunity to decide by voting for the delegation supporting one of these two men which philosophy will be held by the California delegation to the Republican Convention. These delegates will in turn determine the Republican platform of 1964 as well as the 1964 Republican Presidential nominee.
Readily available are articles and books which define the conservative position as expounded by Barry Goldwater. I need not therefore present his position. But as a Republican I must ask the question, "Can I support such a man who consistently is out of step with the main stream of Republican policy?" Two examples of this are: Firstly, his opposition to all 25 major issues specifically favored by the Republican National Platform of 1960 (even Everett Dirksen, no liberal, opposed only four). Secondly, during the eight years of the Eisenhower Administration his voting record showing support of this administration was less than 60% (as compared to a better than 80% record for Senator Kuchel). Likewise, how can I be expected to support a candidate that has demanded nuclear warfare in Vietnam, diplomatic ruptures with all Communist governments, and an end to "wasting our money" in support of the U.N.? But let us not tarry on these negative points. Let us move on to the positive and to Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

As a New Yorker, before coming to California I have had the opportunity of supporting Gov. Rockefeller in two gubernatorial elections. During his past five years in office, New York State has gone forward with a government that is progressive and believes in fiscal integrity. Every state budget during his administration has been balanced on a pay-as-you-go basis. He eliminated a $700,000,000 deficit inherited from the previous Democratic administration and reduced the tax-finances debt by $116,000,000. Such fiscal policies linked with a climate friendly to the free enterprise system have resulted in over 2,600 major new plants or expansion in New York State since 1959 which in turn has produced thousands of new jobs for her citizens. In 32 of the last 30 months, New York State has had a lower unemployment rate than the majority of states in our union. This is the conservatism which marks a true Republican.

Mr. Rockefeller, like millions of other Americans, does not believe the responsibility of good government is solely fiscal integrity. With the population of our nation and the world rapidly expanding, governments have the responsibility of guiding all the people into higher standards of living. A few cannot be allowed to achieve great heights at the expense of the many. If such were the case then Marx and Engels would be correct in their analysis of the free enterprise system, and as a Christian I could not support a system which allows for such exploitation. Thus programs for insuring the general welfare of the populace need to be projected and initiated. Such programs include better educational facilities (both lower and higher education), aid for the aged, employment and training for our youth, better housing for low income families, laws encouraging private development of all housing, improvement of transportation (both highway and rail), aid for health and mental health, and lastly, cultural and recreational programs.

Few will argue against the need for such programs and facilities. Disagreements occur when discussing the means by which they are to be implemented. To claim simply that the best government is the least government and all such programs should be therefore controlled by either local government or by the private sector of our economy is naive and unrealistic. To fear big government because it is big is just as wrong as to desire big government for its power. Many of the programs previously mentioned are national in their scope and though many can and should be effectively administered on the local government level, coordination on the national level is needed if our entire country and not just one
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section is to advance in the future (i.e., interstate highway system and the post office). As our society becomes more complex she will demand greater and more diverse services from our government. The governmental structure of one hundred years ago cannot meet the demands of today. Therefore let us be realistic and recognize big government is here to stay and what it needs is an effective administrator and executive. Such a man as proven by his record is Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

With the pressure of a larger population and bigger government it is imperative that the rights of the individual be protected. This nation was created to give expression, validity and purpose to the heritage which proclaimed the supreme worth and dignity of each individual. Republicans historically have believed that whatever can be done should be done by either private groups or local and state government in order to keep the government close to all the people, so as to protect their individual interests. Today this needs to be restated but with a particular emphasis on the word ALL. Our task is to help make our heritage a reality for ALL citizens by guaranteeing each individual equality of opportunity and the rights that are his under the U.S. Constitution. This can be done only if all levels of government are involved. Ever since the beginning of the Republican Party, the Party of Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation, civil rights have been a vital concern of the party. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the first two civil rights bills since the Civil War Reconstruction Period were passed (despite Sen. Goldwater's voting both times in the negative). Both the Republican and Democratic Party Platforms of 1960 commit our Congress to civil rights legislation. Gov. Rockefeller fully supports the House bill as did the overwhelming majority of House Republicans when they voted 138 to 34 in favor for its passage. (Sen. Goldwater's position once again is in opposition.) As has been stated by Gov. Rockefeller, "In 1964, America cannot tolerate a situation in which all American citizens are expected to fight for their nation and pay taxes—but not all of them enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizenship as set forth in the Constitution and the laws of the land."

Much can be said concerning Gov. Rockefeller's views on foreign policy and our role in the United Nations, but space allows only this one statement on the U.N. "It is a symbol of the hopes, of the aspirations, of the faith in peace and in the future which is the common bond of peoples everywhere...I would not abandon to the Communists the only existing universal machinery for peace." Thus once again the governor disagrees with the senator from Arizona.

In a couple of short pages we have left the crossroad and ventured part way down the Progressive Road. But now too quickly we must return to the crossroad and decide which way the Republican Party is to go, come this June 2nd. Progressive or Reactionary? If you decide for a conservative but forward looking representation at the July convention, vote for the Rockefeller delegation headed by California's own senior U.S. senator Thomas H. Kuchel (other delegates include George Christopher, Goodwin Knight, and Leonard K. Firestone). Remember you only have a choice between two delegations. Cast a vote for a progressive future in the Republican Party. Vote for Rockefeller.

SAVE THE DATE—Thursday evening, May 14, 7:30 p.m., for the Spring Quarter Faculty Forum. The topic of discussion is "Catholic-Protestant Ecumenicity." Cardinal McIntyre of the LA Diocese has designated the Rev. Dr. P. J. Dignan as his representative. Also participating is Prof. John Christopher, recent Catholic panelist on CBS Televisions "Protestant-Catholic Dialogue." The Protestant Church will be represented by Dr. Edward J. Carnell and Dr. Paul King Jewett.
For sixteen months now Rome has known
of Hitler's savage butcheries in Poland.
Why not a word about it from the Pope--
that where the steeples of his churches rise,
Hitler's chimneys pour forth their ghastly smoke:
That where on Sundays the church bells ring,
on weekdays the flesh of men is burned.

The Deputy is an answer to our cry for relevance. This controversial play by
Rolf Hochhuth depicts the situation of the church under the rule of Hitler and
the various ways in which Christians acted responsibly and irresponsibly as
deputies of Christ. The drama centers around the position of the Pope, Pius XII,
who chooses to act with silence against the murder of the Jews. The Pope's
tragic moral choice of silence is determined by the expediency of state--finan-
cial and diplomatic--and for this silence the Pope is called a criminal by one
of his own Jesuit Priests. In contrast to this inaction Hochhuth demonstrates
Christian responsibility in the persons of a German Evangelical S.S. officer,
Gerstein, and a Roman Catholic Priest, Riccardo, who emerge as the two Christian
heroes of the play.

Gerstein is a Bible believing, Bible studying and Bible living Christian who joins
the S.S. in order to do all he can to frustrate Hitler's crimes. He cheats, lies, mu
becomes a traitor, to his country and his own life, in good conscience.
The necessity for this defiance of law and traditional morality is clear to him;
he stumbles over no tragic moral choice, and explains to Riccardo his decision
to action by saying, "There was no terrible ordeal, no pangs of conscience, none
at all." The portrait of Gerstein is biographical and not fiction and President
of the Evangelical Church of Hesse said of the real Gerstein, "The uncanny
mastery with which he camouflaged his inward Christian being by an outward de-
meanor of the perfect S.S. man, with the sole aim of giving succor to others,
made a mockery of all ordinary standards."

"Doing nothing is as bad as taking part. It is--I don't know--perhaps it is
still less forgiveable. We are priests! God can forgive a hangman for such
work, but not a priest, not the Pope!" With these words Riccardo reveals his
rebellion against the authorities of his church and his higher allegiance to
God. Riccardo's horror at the Pope's refusal to issue a strong note of condemna-
tion of Hitler's murder of the Jews causes him to contemplate the sacrificial
murder of the Pope. When he is frustrated in this plan he assumes his own re-
ponsibility as a minister of Christ and accompanies a box-car load of Roman
Jews to extermination at Auschwitz. Riccardo is unable to understand how the
Pope can comfortably focus his attention to the dogma of the Virgin when there
exists under his roof poverty, deprivation and murder. Riccardo chooses to be-
come a Christian existentially involved in the issue of his day and is obedient
unto death, even as the Pope washes from his fingers a spot of ink in a brass
basin. Riccardo's words about Rome should challenge us at Fuller:
The things they think about in Rome:
Take poverty, for instance, which, in practice, means
that as a nation's churches grow in number,
so do its prostitutes. Naples and Sicily--

Dicran Berberian is a Junior at F.T.S. He received his B.S. from Columbia
University.

cont. p. 8
centers of vice beneath the window of the Vatican.
Instead of helping, we debate
how frequently a married couple may cohabit.
Or if a widow may remarry.
And now, to top it off, the dogma of the Virgin.
Does he (the Pope) have anything else to do?

Hochhuth's contention is that a man cannot look about him at the injustice and
inhumanity of life, accept these conditions as a matter of course, and still re-
main a Christian. The Christian identifies himself with the suffering world and
acts in accordance with justice, responsibility and courage. For a man to accept
Auschwitz or segregation as an inevitability of this world is to affirm that
"life as an idea is dead." The placid acceptance of social evil as inevitable
is in tacit agreement to all that refutes "creator, creation, and the creature."
This driving contention of the author prompts Albert Schweitzer to say of The
Deputy, "It is...a solemn warning to our culture admonishing us to forego our
acceptance of inhumanity which leaves us unconcerned."

Hochhuth and The Deputy have been denounced all over the world by the conserva-
tive press. In reaction to the announcement of the play opening in Rome, "Il
Quotidiano," an organ for militant Catholic Action, wrote "we shall see whether
the Marxist and anticlerical wave will sweep its mark also into the center of
Christianity." Such reaction indicates the bitter and violent criticism that
any Christian who tries to do anything in the world will encounter, even from
within the church. But, it is a criticism of which Old Testament prophets and
New Testament martyrs were unafraid. Our concern as Christians should not be
self survival. Rather, we should identify ourselves with the suffering of God
in order that we may become fanatic enough to act against the tide of life and
in conformity to our faith. As Christian students preparing for the ministry
we should be able to say with Gerstein:

I will not survive the work I must do.
A Christian in these days cannot
survive if he is truly Christian--
beware the steady churchgoers--
I am thinking of the Christians Kierkegaard
had in mind: the spies of God. I am
a spy in the S.S.
and spies are executed--I am aware of that.

*****

STUDENT COUNCIL CORNER

Yes, the Student Council is concerned with communicating to you. And things are
already happening.
1. Each student has been given a list of names and addresses of Council members.
2. S.C. is in the process of scheduling biweekly or monthly open afternoon
(NOT 6:30 a.m.) meetings.
3. S.C. is seeking administration approval to post S.C. minutes on the bulletin
board.
4. A representative to the opinion has been appointed.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOU! Next year we will need responsible men to fill posi-
tions of leadership on the following committees: Chapel, Interseminary Movement,
Forum, Yearbook, Spring Banquet, Christmas Party, Welcome, Ushers, Library Chapel,
and Red Cross. If you have any interest in these areas, please see your S.C.
representatives Chairman have already been chosen for the following committees:
Big Brother, Curriculum, Fall Picnic, Social Action, Housing and Employment,
Music, and Athletics.
THAT WAS THE ELECTION THAT WAS

Now that the student body elections are over and finals are just around the corner, perhaps it might be appropriate to share a few thoughts I have been collecting since that eventful Tuesday, March 31, when I read of the impending student body elections.

First, our constitution is in need of amendment with regards to Article I of the By-laws, "Nominations and Elections." I was glad to see that an ad hoc committee was duly appointed for this matter by former Student Council President, Al Cash. But it does strike me as strange that only seniors (Bob Letsinger, Ralph Wright, and Al Cash) were appointed. Another small detail left me scratching my head. I would have appreciated an announcement as to 1) why the proposed amendment vote was cancelled, and 2) when a new amendment might be proposed.

Second, for the benefit of the many illiterites--politically (not academically), perhaps an announcement should be made in the waning weeks of the winter quarter as to the date of the presentation of nominees by the nominating committee and Student Council. Would it be "unconstitutional" or contrary to any existing or non-existing by-law that the members of the nominating committee be listed?

I was pleased to see that one of the nominees from the floor was elected to office--I do not mean this as a reflection upon either the nominating committee or the other nominees. But the advantage taken of this token privilege of nominating a candidate from the floor and electing him to office portends student interest in the affairs of our seminary.

Frances Schiller has an M.A. in English Literature from Purdue University and is the wife of Eric Schiller, a graduate student at F.T.S.

Roger Fung is a Junior at F.T.S. He received his B.A. from San Francisco State College in 1963.
Third, I was informed that an announcement would be made to the effect that the tabulations from the elections would be available for personal perusal by any interested student. Funny, but I don't recall seeing the announcement of the tabulations or the tabulations themselves yet. I agree with the policy of permitting interested students to look at the results rather than having them published, but why the delay in the announcement?

Finally, perhaps attendance at the two class elections might have improved if these elections were held one week after the student body election or run-off. (The present by-laws, Article I, Section 4, do not provide for any run-off situation.)

Well, that was the election that was. Good luck, Sam, Dave, Dave, Stan, Paul and John. Remember, TTTW, but we're waiting for TTYTBV (The year that will be, deo volente). We want action, theological as well as social.

Roger C. Fung

(Election results: Primary: 206 votes; Run-off: 194 votes out of a student body of 259 (not including Monday ministers) for a percentage of 79%. In 1963, 230 voted of 275 for a percentage of 83%).

Editors

*****

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

WE TEND TO BECOME WHAT WE READ

Christianity Today recently reported that students at Harvard University sneered at Billy Graham's dependence upon Time as his authoritative source of information concerning our society and world. As I have browsed through the periodicals in our own reading room, I too have wondered about the appetites we evangelicals have for information concerning things of civic, national, or international importance.

We seem to have a preponderance of socio-economic-political periodicals that represent only the center or right of center opinion. I feel that Fuller should have a broader representation of the political spectrum in the periodicals section of the library. If we evangelicals are to become identified with the causes of democracy, reform and social justice, as well as orthodoxy, evangelism and missions, we must become aware of the thinking of men who wield influence and express concern for these areas.


Roger C. Fung

(Dr. Hubbard advised students to take any suggestions regarding library publications to Dr. Schoonhoven. Recently a petition concerning the addition of certain political periodicals signed by fourteen students was given to him. There was no reply. When asked about his decision, Dr. Schoonhoven stated they would not be ordered.)

Editors
REACTION TO FORUM ON INSPIRATION

It hardly needed a body of self-appointed critics to tell us that the recent panel discussion was feeble. Certain important factors seem, however, to have escaped the notice of the student assessors.

1. Too many questions were verbose, complex and obscure to the point of virtual unintelligibility. Such questions cannot command serious answers.

2. In spite of the good material provided, questioners in the main concentrated on a single issue which, given artificial importance and divorced from context, could not provide discussion of true relevance.

3. Questioners also adopted what is in my view a radically false approach which can lead only to a false dilemma, and ultimately to confusion and futility. This approach is not to be encouraged. For a constructive discussion, it needs correction at the very outset.

4. Insufficient attention was given even to what was said, and not said. Points had to be repeated, and one of your letters can even contain the absurd statement that panelists must be engaged in either ecclesiastical slumbers or Kierkegaardian gymnastics - a plain sign of inattentive listening. As James puts it: Be swift to hear and slow to speak, not vice versa.

The point is that no successful panel can be held on this or any subject unless pains are first taken to ask, not any questions, but the right questions. True answers cannot be given to false questions.

Dr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley

HEAT WAVE

With all ovens, steam tables, dishwasher, and lights going in the dining room and kitchen, it stands to reason this would be the hottest place in Fuller Seminary. It is very nice to have air conditioning in many other places in the building. We are not complaining. However, now would be a nice time to think of the kitchen crew.

Turning the lights out might help, but the students have to see what they are eating. Wouldn't someone take pity on our kitchen crew and provide a cooling system of some kind so that we too may survive.

Thanks in advance,
Janet Stricklin
Kitchen Crew

A GREEN STAMP THEOLOGY?

Under the conviction that I ought to practice good stewardship of my earthly possessions, I once pledged a small sum to a certain missionary society. Among the unexpected blessings I received in return was a certificate announcing that I had just purchased five "shares in eternity." Since then I have received many similar such rewards, all the way from lapel pins to citations from foreign governments. These are at present being consumed by "moth and rust" along with the green stamps I received from Alpha-Beta last week (and also that portion of my money which I did not designate toward their purchase). Yesterday I had the privilege of adding to that illustrious collection a 5 x 9 manilla envelope offering me the opportunity of being a partner in a similar, but even grander venture for promoting good stewardship, on behalf of the ongoing work of Fuller Seminary.
Sarcasm aside, it appears as though a more sophisticated sort of green-stamp theology has permeated the administration's fund raising activities. If the school has been given these books and does not know what to do with them, why not sell them through the bookstore as with any other volumes? Under the present scheme, isn't each donor of $100 just being deluded into thinking that he can legitimately claim a tax deduction for what in reality is a book purchase? If such a gimmick proves stimulating to this year's fund drive, what prize will be next year's offering? Are we to use similar methods in teaching the joys of sacrificial giving to our future congregations? I could go on, but I have to ask myself what I would do if I were faced with the problem of financing a seminary.

Don Grey

DON'T JUST SIT THERE!

I was very interested in your two articles in the March issue on Robinson's Honest to God. Walter Ray accused Robinson of being a dishonest atheist writing "about a marvelous new religion," and Laurie Lampert praised his honesty in admitting that "twentieth century man is discovering that he can get along quite well by himself," and that "modern man is no longer tied to...a dualistic world of natural and supernatural. Is Christianity so tied?" Thinking that this would cause some good debate among the student body, I was eager to read the Letters to the Editor in the following issue. But there weren't any! What is the matter? Doesn't anyone read the opinion? Or did they all agree with Lampert's position and, seeing that it was the second article, feel that it ended the case in their favor? Or, maybe, no one reads such books as Honest to God?

Bruce Crapuchettes

ATTENTION ALL STUDENTS:

Please do not feed bread crumbs to the goldfish in the fountain in the garth. It clogs their digestive system.
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