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What does the word "universalist" convey to you? What kind of caricature is formed? What kind of defenses go up? Does a universalist look different? Does he have a shifty untrustworthy almost "satanic" look about him? Do we immediately label him as one who just does not know his Bible? Indeed, do we ask the "universalist" to prove himself a Christian on grounds other, or beyond, those by which we measure ourselves?

The only Christian community in which I have moved since my conversion has been quite conservative, a particularist one, in fact. Over the years, the general impression that this community has left with me is that if you are "really" a Christian and "really" believe your Bible, then you cannot possibly be a "universalist". What I am really trying to say is that there is a general conception that anyone who would accept the label and the liable of "universalist", does not have a Biblical leg to stand on. And so, the questions asked above are not unfounded in experience but rather have grown out of experience and may, therefore, be asked with real meaning.

And how may I ask, have we arrived at this juncture in our thinking? For the most part it has been without a serious examination of the evidence. For there seems to be some sort of emotional content in the word "universalist" that strikes fear to the heart, paralysis to the will, and constipation to the intellect. Part of this is undoubtedly due to the fact that we are unaware that there are different types of universalism. If I speak of the universal sufficiency of the atonement of Christ, I receive no argument even from the strictest Calvinist. In the one sense then, we are all "universalists". Then we might also mention "old universalism", a type which has accepted a philosophic approach to the question of salvation rather than a Biblical one. It is probably to this one that we flee for our caricatures. But what if we discover another type of universalism, one that is grounded in a much higher view of the authority of the Scriptures, and has several exegetical legs on which to stand?

There is, in fact, such a type, a "neo-universalism", which may not be as "neo-" as most of us are aware. Someone said of Barth's commentary on Romans (1933) that it "fell like a bombshell on the playground of the theologians", and it is precisely in this "bomb" that we find an example of this type of Biblical universalism. In commenting on Romans 5:6 (While we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly.) Barth states:

Christ died for us. For us—that is, in so far as by His death we recognize the law of our own dying; in so far as in His death the invisible God becomes for us visible; in so far as His death is the place where atonement with God takes place (iii, 25, v. 9), and where we, who have rejected our Creator, return to His love; and in so far as in His Death the paradox of the righteousness and the identity of His holy wrath and His forgiving mercy becomes for us--the truth. The new man is therefore brought into being by that which is pre-eminent over and prior to, all the con-
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EDITORIAL

The current election contains a point of contact between Fuller Seminary and the surrounding community. At heart it is a moral problem which transcends political affiliations. A proposition on the November ballot seeks to amend the constitution of California. The amendment would give the individual absolute discretion in choosing to whom he will sell, lease, or rent his property.

Individual freedom, initiative, and dignity are impinged upon when the government dictates what can and cannot be done with one's own property. Fair housing legislation against which the proposition is aimed, does limit the individual in the disposal of his property. It makes unlawful the practice of discrimination in housing accommodations. Legislation does not remove prejudice. Prejudice is an individual matter of conscience and cannot be changed by legislation. The answer to race problems is a change of heart on the part of those who are prejudiced. The Church can play a major role in bringing about such a change.

But what do we as Christians say to the individual member of a minority group? His freedom, initiative, and dignity are being impinged upon when he cannot buy a certain house simply because he has the wrong skin color or the wrong nationality. We see too much of such discrimination to ignore it. Financial concern and simple prejudice are the main causes of this discrimination, and in either case the dignity of the individual is degraded by the one refusing to make the sale. In the first case material return is made more important than personal value, and in the second the person's worth is called into question because of the color of his skin.

Should not the law of love govern our action in such situations? The importance of the other individual should take priority over our own financial situation or prejudice. We should see the need for justice not only in our own dealings with the individual, but also the need for justice throughout society.

In recognizing the inadequacy in the singleness of our individual attempts at justice we see the necessity for collective legislation for the general welfare. Law is the method for securing justice in our society. If this kind of discrimination in housing is wrong, legislation that declares this discrimination unlawful would seem to be in order.

The limitation of the property rights of the individual is not a retraction of his rights, but only a regulation of them, as for example, is a zoning law. It should be remembered that rights are never absolute in a just and ordered society. This is especially true for the Christian who is admonished to manage his property as the steward of God. The regulation of the rights of those who discriminate secures the rights of those who are being discriminated against. Every individual in a society has certain inalienable rights, but his neighbor has identical rights. One cannot buy property in downtown Pasadena and begin grazing cattle there.

Although prejudice cannot be reasonably legislated against, the practice of this prejudice can be. The opinion urges you to support the defeat of Proposition 14 and to vote NO on November 3rd.

editors
********

OCTOBER DATEBOOK

October 8 Day of Prayer
October 22 Debate on the minister and Proposition 14 -- Social Action Committee
October 26-30 Conference on the Missionary Task of the Church. -- FMF
November 3 Election Day -- VOTE
crete possibilities of human life. This paramount factor cannot be identified with human possessions, because by it they are finally and critically negated, nor must it be confounded with even the most intimate religious experience that may be vouchsafed to us as disciples of Jesus and of Him crucified because these "things of religion" are precisely the things which Jesus passed by in order to die. What Christ has done, He has done apart from us, in so far as we are "we". It follows therefore, that no fundamental deprivation is suffered by those who, owing to their being separated, either by time or by locality, from the scene of the Crucifixion, cannot share in the actual experiences of those who stood by the Cross. If it were not so, for us would be limited to a particular group of men and women. Those who do not see Christ according to the flesh and have no direct experience of Him are not less reconciled to God through Him than others are. (Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. E.C. Hoskyns, Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1950, p. 160.

Now I am not proposing to answer here this objection to a particularist interpretation of Romans 5:6, but how do you answer it? Are you going to sweep this problem under the rug with all the other hard ones, or are you going to suffer a little unpleasant anxiety to find out whether Barth and others are right or wrong? And, more important, will you submit yourself unreservedly to your findings? Will you allow your reason, tempered by the Word of God and prayer, to have the power of persuasion that it ought to have? Or will you simply write the whole thing off in a sort of guilt-by-association type of statement—"He's a dirty universalist!"—with all the 'proper' enuendos and overtones?

In a day when it is becoming increasingly difficult to get anyone to listen to the preaching of eminent and final judgment, or of the holiness of God, or of the wrath of God, it is absolutely essential that we clarify this issue for ourselves and for those to whom we minister—and do it now! *****

PROPOSITION 14—WHAT IS IT?

Many students have asked about Proposition 14 which will be on the California ballot this fall. The opinion presents the following information for the purpose of informing the Fuller Family.

Proposition 14 is one of a series of seventeen initiatives which will be presented to the voters of California in a statewide referendum in the November election. The key paragraph in Prop. 14 is as follows:

Neither the State nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit, or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses.

The League of Women Voters in California has compiled the following summary regarding Proposition 14 in their publication Pros-Cons. the opinion has reprinted the capsule of Proposition 14 in its entirety. It was compiled by experts from both points of view.

Pros-Cons: Proposition 14

SALES AND RENTALS OF RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY

Amends the California Constitution to prohibit the State Legislature and local governments from placing any limitations on a person's right to refuse to sell or rent his residential property to another person. Excludes acquisition by eminent domain, public accommodations such as hotels, and property owned by the State. Effect would be to nullify portions of existing laws (such as the Rumford and Unruh Acts) which deal with racial and religious discrimination by residential property owners and their agents; to guarantee property owners the ability to reject applicants for any reason, including race and religion; to remove from governing bodies the ability to pass laws against discrimination in housing on the basis of race, color, religion, natural origin or ancestry.

FOR: This measure restores the owner's right to control the rental and sale of his residential property. It nullifies...
the sections of the Rumford Act and the Unruh Act that apply to residential property owners. Recently enacted legislation, especially the Rumford Act which is enforced by the Fair Employment Practices Commission, unfairly persecutes and harasses property owners. These laws have the effect of forcing property owners to sell or rent to members of minority groups even if it means suffering financial loss. When the State subordinates the rights of individuals to a special group, it is a move away from a free society and toward collectivism. This amendment is necessary to protect citizens from the abuses of forced housing legislation now and in the future. It removes coercion and paves the way for voluntary co-operation among the races. The right of absolute control in the rental and sale of one's residential property is so basic to our society that it should be guaranteed in the California Constitution beyond legislative jurisdiction.

"Are you a liberal or a conservative?" A question like this is impossible for me to answer, for at times I find it commendable to be a liberal, such as being against Proposition 14, and at other times a conservative approach seems more meritorious, as in dealing with the problems of welfare and foreign aid. Therefore to naively think of a person as either a liberal or a conservative is a gross generalization.

Many have become fuzzy and unclear in their thinking regarding conservatism. Too many generalizations are floating around which bother me to no end. For example, to be a conservative Christian one is not necessarily a closed-minded, literalistic fundamentalist. Christ came to set men free. Free from legalism, traditionalism, and closed-mindedness. Those who hold to our historic faith should of all people be most open-minded. For there is nothing to fear from science or infidel if Christ really is the truth. Therefore the attitude of a conservative Christian should be most open and liberal. Why then is a conservative Christian generally thought of in the world as being narrow-minded? This is because in reality many of them are. But only a generalizer will equate the two. A clear thinker will see that one does not necessarily follow the other. Generalizers also tend to see all Calvinists as fatalists, all Birchers as segregationalists, all conservative Christians as teetotalers, and all little old ladies from Pasadena as rightists. This is unfair and certainly untrue.

With this in mind I would like to state that in the area of politics I am a conservative. But upon stating this I immediately realize that I have to clarify many issues. Since most people usually generalize, many will now assume that I am in favor of the initiative as stated in Proposition 14, that I am against the Civil Rights Bill, and that I worship Barry Goldwater and think that he is the greatest.
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American statesman since Abraham Lincoln. All of these are very false. Yet I am confident that a conservative philosophy of government will engender the soundest and truly most progressive government in reality. Conservative politics are not narrow-minded nor traditional, though I will admit that many conservatives are both. I point out that conservatism is not traditionalism. It is often accused of it, but this is because the basis of its principles have nothing to do with the social, economic and political landscape that changes from decade to decade. Its principles are based on the nature of man. It realizes that man is not only a physical being but also a spiritual one. Liberalism tends to meet the physical needs of an individual only. It gives him something to eat, something to wear, and a place to stay. But if this is all that it does for him, it is treating him as an animal rather than as a human being. Man is predominantly a spiritual being and desperately needs self-respect. But this can not be given to him by someone else. He must earn this for himself. Circumstances change. And so do the problems that are shaped by circumstances. But the principles that govern the solution of problems do not. The problems of today's complex world are complicated, and solutions cannot necessarily be given immediately. Conservatism carefully studies the past and the future and makes decisions that will last, not ones that just gratify the moment, though, of course, it is highly concerned for the moment.

I am firmly convinced that when we look at the individual political issues involved in the present campaign, it is conservatism that has the answers. And this is because the principles that are at the base of its solutions are sound. Following are a few of these issues and the conservative principle which governs its solution. Let me emphasize that I am not giving solutions but only stating principles by which a conservative seeks his solutions. The actual solutions are much too complex for an article of this length, for the problems themselves are so involved.

Welfare and foreign aid: We want to help people to help themselves. We certainly want to help people as much as any liberal, but we realize that we must treat them as spiritual beings. They need self-respect to exist.

Farm program: The principle here is the law of supply and demand. If we do not need so many farmers why keep them in existence? Let us help them find new skills.

Income tax: A man should not be penalized for superior work production and initiative. These are desirable and should be encouraged.

National debt: Sound economics demands a continuous striving toward a balanced budget. Instead of this our present trend is to deliberate whether to raise the national debt by a little or a lot.

Foreign policy: Peace must be attained through strength. It is impossible to be in a position to bargain with anyone else if one is weak. When at war (cold or otherwise) the only objective is victory, and victory has never yet been attained in the history of man only through defense.

Size of government: The task of government is to enforce law and order and to defend its people so that they will have the most freedom possible. The bigger it gets and the more programs it has the less free its people are. Certainly its growth is often legitimate and necessary, but never-the-less the principle stands.

If I could vote (and I cannot because I am not legally a resident of any one state) I would vote for the Goldwater-Miller ticket—not so much because I am for the individuals involved, but because I want to see the United States run in a politically conservative manner. I am especially against the liberal form of government that Johnson and Humphrey advocate. Their program is leading down the road to socialism and eventually to a police state. I do not think for a moment that they will personally bring this upon us within their term of office nor within my lifetime, but that is the direction they are taking. I have lived in a socialist police state for two years in Communist China and I want to do all within my power to protect my country from it. ******
Behind the fanfare and activity commonly associated with a presidential year, and even behind the unique confrontation of ideologies presently making itself felt, there seems to be an emerging question, which, while one among many, is assuming a certain priority: "May we prevail?"

Sensing the urgency of this question, Senator Goldwater and those associated with his cause have been calling the American people to a rigorous defense of the American cause, of our way of life, from the insidious infiltration of Communism. To a certain extent, such a position can be lauded; but the implications of the conservative position, if demonstrated, would point to a danger just as great as the present Soviet threat.

Arnold Toynbee, in "Conditions of Survival" (Saturday Review, August 29, 1964, pp. 24-26, 193), brings forth a thesis which, if taken seriously, would deal a severe blow to the presuppositions of American conservatism. Traditionally, the individual has approached the question of ethics by differentiating the personal good from the common good. "I am egocentric insofar as I am seeking to achieve my own goals and benefit." "I am not egocentric if I am oriented toward the common good." In the context of the present discussion, the alternative to egocentricism is presumed to be one's fight for the American way of life. Toynbee responds to this approach to political ethics with his notion of "nosism" (or weism). By infusing our suprapersonal hopes with "nosism" we are subtly, but nevertheless actually, establishing the "collective counterpart to egotism."

Whether for good or for evil, man is far stronger when he is acting collectively than when he is playing a lone hand; and also when he is acting collectively, he can behave selfishly without being pulled up short by his conscience, because he can delude himself into believing that he is subordinating his self-centeredness to the plural number from the singular. (p. 24.)

It is all too easy, in many contexts, to channel our own self-orientation into areas where we can feel that we are doing some good, and to delude ourselves about our motives while doing so. Hence it is that the conservative finds his cause to fight and does so to borrow a Time cliche—"with evangelical fervor. While seeking to eradicate an external danger, he is also opening himself up to even greater dangers from within.

The shortcomings of the conservative American myth are lucidly pointed out in the Toynbee article:

...man is now threatening to liquidate the human race in his attempts to satisfy two collective lusts for power. One of these is the lust to make one's own national fraction of the human race top dog over the rest of one's fellow human beings; the other lust is the lust to convert the rest of them to one's own religion or ideology...

(p. 26.)

One might want Toynbee to clarify what he means by the second lust, but suffice it to say that he is objecting strongly to the human desire to overcome and conquer. It is the first lust which bears singular importance for the present discussion. When we allow ourselves as individuals to deem the nation more important than the world, and when we as a nation begin to look on every situation with an eye to the furtherance of our cause, we do indeed err. If the conservative leader is one who is going to demand respect, it is time for him to look closely at the image he is spreading throughout the world. With the recognition of the complexity of world problems (Toynbee cites cessation of war, social and economic classes, and the population explosion), there ought to follow a broadening of our hopes and ideals beyond any narrow self-interest. We bear a responsibility to the entire world community— as peers! We cannot...
now afford the luxury of being parochial in our outlook on politics. Neither can we wish to dictate the terms of community on the international level. We need urgently to begin to understand what the brotherhood of man on a social level implies.

The hope for a world government ought therefore now to take a high place in our inventory of human hopes. Unfortunately, however, this hope—indispensable though it has become—is not yet widely cherished. Probably there are few people yet alive whose paramount loyalty is being given to the human race as a whole. For a great majority of the human race, their paramount loyalty is still not ecumenical but sectional. Our first hope is that our own tribe will be dominant over other tribes and that our own religion or ideology will supplant other religions and ideologies.  

(p. 193)

I suggest that the answer to the question originally proposed: "May we prevail?" lies mainly in our understanding of the word "we." This is not a time for insularity; that was tested twenty years ago in Europe, and the results of that "test" remain to plague men's minds. We may prevail! The path of prevailing is not a straight path; it does not consist of fighting one enemy and ignoring the rest of the world and its problems. The American program against Communism ought to be fully understood by us, by the Communist countries, and by the world—they are a threat to freedom everywhere, and must therefore be resisted. To this the liberal would add a call for a deep awareness that if we are to prevail, we must purge ourselves of egocentricism gone collective. We must cease viewing the world situations with ourselves sola in mind. The conservative answers just do not fit the needs which we—the world!—encounter today.

******

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Goldwater and the Negro

In light of our interest here at Fuller in both social action and political issues, I found the following editorial by Fulton Lewis, Jr. in The Daily Oklahoma (Sept. 22, 1964) very enlightening with regard to the cloudy issue of who among the presidential candidates truly has the interests of our minority groups at heart. Mr. Lewis wrote:

A District of Columbia Negro who is backing Barry Goldwater for president has been threatened with death.

He is Benjamin Brown, a former Democrat who is a GOP precinct captain in southeast Washington. The 29 year old baggage clerk has received a steady stream of abusive phone calls—all anonymous—since he began working for Goldwater.

The calls warn that Brown's home will be bombed if he continues to "sell out" his people. His wife and children have also been threatened. Brown, now under police protection, has refused to back down.

"My life has been threatened for supporting Barry Goldwater," he says. "But I am standing firm. I am not a turncoat to any race nor to any minority group. I want to work for all the people."

Brown cites Goldwater's personal history in explaining his stand. The GOP nominee, he says, fought for the integration of schools, public facilities, and the air national guard in his native Arizona, contributing his own funds to the civil rights campaign.

"Not until he got the presidential bug," argues Brown, "did Lyndon Johnson exhibit any concern for the Negro." He refers to the president's congressional record of adamant opposition to civil rights legislation.

"How can I support a man who has done nothing to support the Negro?" Brown asks.

Jim Probert
the opinion welcomes a new column to its pages. It is designed to stimulate you as you construct your personal synthesis of Christianity and culture. It will be written by the Gadfly and will appear in each succeeding issue.

THE GADFLY

Now that my summer musings and wanderings are over I find myself ready to metamorphize into the world of Barth, Brunner, and Bultmann. With the only ten weeks away it certainly is very tempting to cloister oneself into a monastic cell with the learned tones recommended by his professorial mentors. Therefore to keep such a rigormortis from affecting our total world view, this column will be raising, during the coming year, various contemporary theological issues. Hopefully such discussions should whet our appetite for the controversial in the world around us. Your objections to the issues raised in this column are welcomed though supporting statements will always affect my ego in a more positive way. So then, let us be off on our first foray of the year.

One of the cardinal tenets of our Christian faith has been the dignity of the individual. We preach Jesus Christ as a personal savior who has broken into history to save all men. Those of us who have accepted this redemptive act of God pray not to a distant God, but to a personal God. Likewise no one can deny the liberating effect that such a theology of the individual had upon the economic, political, and social structures of the Europe of the sixteenth century. Even today our American culture and political system has its roots firmly grounded in the Protestant theology which speaks of the inherent worth and dignity of the individual.

One other concept of our Lord's teachings was the temporal nature of our world. Great emphasis is placed on a future life while the things of this world are treated as inconsequential if not as a stumbling block to those entering the Kingdom of God. The rich young ruler was saddened to learn that he must sell all that he had. We are told to lay up treasures in heaven as opposed to those on earth where moth and rust will corrupt.

Unfortunately some evangelicals in the past few years have reversed this emphasis of the Gospel. Instead of human dignity being upheld and property rights being relegated to a secondary position we find the rights of the individual being made subservient to the rights of property. What then can explain this paradox of evangelicals supporting a view contrary to the teachings of the inspired Scriptures? Only one answer appears obvious to me and that is SIN—the sin of putting oneself first, of placing one's property rights first before basic human rights of other individuals. Now that our society is affluent enough to allow evangelicals a high standard of living, they protect it as vehemently as a non-Christian, even at the cost of over-throwing the Gospel. No longer does the law of love determine one's actions but selfishness and defence of the status quo is the byword of some affluent Christians.

Today this conflict is vividly portrayed in the controversy surrounding Proposition 14 whose proponents claim will repeal the Rumford Fair Housing Act. In fact, however, it will repeal all laws protecting the individual in the field of housing and will make it impossible for any local or state agency to ever do anything about housing discrimination. All the major church groups of California have come out opposed to this amendment on the grounds that this is contrary to the gospel message. Yet it is still uncertain whether this is enough to defeat this segregationalist amendment. As Christians we have just one month to do our part to uphold our religious and moral principles by actively supporting through our time and monies the defeat of Proposition 14. Let us not be like the intellectuals (as well as the church) of Germany who in the 1930's watched the evil force of Nazism take over their country and then be crushed when they did finally raise their voices in protest. We must speak out today on the evils of segregation and support the inherent worth and dignity of the individual. PAX
CHARGED TO THE SLIGHT BRIGADE

by Alfred Lord Pauperson

I
Half a mint, half a mint,
Half a mint upward,
All in the Valley of Debt
Strode the two hundred.
"Forward the Slight Brigade!"
Charged for the term! he said.
Into the Valley of Debt
Strode the two hundred.

II.
"Forward the Slight Brigade!"
Was there a heart dismayed?
Not, tho' the students knew
Some one had blundered.
Their not to make reply,
Their not to reason why,
Their but to pay -- or hie.
Into the Valley of Debt
Strode the two hundred.

III.
Bills to right of them,
Bills to left of them,
Bills in front of them,
Registers thundered;
Threatened by word "expell",
Boldly they paid and well,
Into the jaws of Debt,
Into a place not swell
Strode the two hundred.

IV.
Flashed all their wallets bare,
Empty they fanned the air,
No, not a dollar there!
Charged by an increase, while
All families wondered.
Plunging an ink-pen stroke
On the last check and broke;
Fussin' and rushin',
Reeling with heartfelt choke,
Shattered and sundered.
Then they strode back, all shot,
Shot out two hundred.

V.
Bills to right of them,
Bills to left of them,
Bills behind them,
Registers thundered;
Stormed at with loans as well,
While bank account fast fell,
They that had paid so well
Came thro' the jaws of Debt,
Back from that place unswell,
What'er was left of them,
Left of two hundred.

VI.
When will their glory fade?
O, a high Charge was made!
Every one wondered.
Honor the price they paid!
Honor the Slight Brigade,
Noble two hundred!

The poet that created the above masterpiece was FRANK E. COHO. Frank is a Middler at PTS. He received his B.A. in German from Westminster College in 1963.

DEBATE OVER THE MINISTER AND PROPOSITION 14

"Should the minister of the Gospel actively support or actively oppose Proposition 14?"
This question will be debated Thursday evening, October 22nd at 7:30 in the Chapel. Sponsored by the Social Action Committee, the debate will bring Dr. Charles Bell, the Pastor of First Baptist Church in Pasadena, Dr. Julian Keiser, the head of Social Action for the United Church of Christ in Southern California, and Dr. Edward J. Carnell of our own faculty together. The debate will be moderated by Roy Brewer, the Chairman of the Social Action Committee. Students, faculty, staff, and friends of the seminary are invited to attend.

*****
CONFERENCE ON THE MISSIONARY TASK OF THE CHURCH

With the theme "Our Task—Mobilization" FMF introduces a new dimension to its annual conference October 26-30. Dr. Horace Fenton, the Associate Director of the Latin American Mission will be directing student thinking each day in Chapel. His messages will deal with the topics "Need For Mobilization," "Pattern For Mobilization," "Contemporary Mobilization," and "Continuous Mobilization."

The problems which are involved in the task of mobilizing the Church will be discussed in three afternoon panels. Leading ministers and theologians in the area will team up with members of the Fuller faculty to analyze these problems. They include Dr. Ganse Little of Pasadena Presbyterian Church, Dr. Leland Hine of California Baptist Seminary, and Dr. Keith Bridston of Pacific Lutheran Seminary in Berkeley. The panels are entitled "The Message and the Motivation," "A Wealthy Church and a Needy World," and "Truth and Consequences."—to put it more directly universal reconciliation, the Church in the world, and ecumenicism. Dr. Kenneth Strachan will moderate the panels.

Gary Copeland who heads the committee which has planned the conference has announced that other activities and opportunities for interaction have also been planned.

********

At the beginning of this new school year, the opinion would like to encourage all students to contribute to the opinion. Only the editorial policy is determined by the editors. Occasionally, however the editors will solicit materials in areas which they consider important.

Become a writer. Contribute to the opinion.

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

PHILIP S. HOFFMAN......EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
JERRY E. WARREN......MANAGING EDITOR
RICHARD M. AVERY.......CONSULTANT