TWO PERSPECTIVES

The two lead articles in this opinion should provoke us all to the most careful thought. The second is written by a thirteen year old junior high school boy who has had some connection with the youth work of one of our seminarians. It is a startling example of the direction which the thought of a brilliant adolescent in our society may take. While it is obviously the first-fruits of a budding thinker, plagued by bad argumentation and inadequate definition, there can be no question that the struggle which these thoughts represent is profound. It is also clear, we think, that many of the misconceptions of Christianity in the article are the result not merely of the general ideas of our society, but of the particular misrepresentations of Christians themselves.

In severe contrast to this is the joyous captivity to Christ and His Word which is reflected in the last pages of Dr. Ladd's article. How to bridge the gap between Egocontrolism in its various forms and true surrender to the true Christ is a task which we all, by His power, must set ourselves to learn.

SABBATICAL REFLECTIONS

by Dr. George E. Ladd

The editors of the opinion have asked me to indicate briefly what I am doing this year on my Sabbatical. Since this is addressed to the Seminary family, I may be permitted to write in a somewhat personal way.

First, I have been trying to understand what is going on in America. I was utterly shocked, and have spent considerable time searching my memory and conscience, when I read in Christianity Today (in Heidelberg's Amerika Haus) of the Winona Lake-Fuller dissolution, partly on the grounds of an alleged defective theology of inspiration on the part of the Fuller Faculty. This hit me personally, for I taught at Winona Lake en route to Europe, and was the last regular Fuller Professor to lecture there. I could not but wonder to what extent I had been responsible for this rupture. However, careful reflection assured me that if Winona Lake has any grounds for dissatisfaction, they must have dredged them up since June. Dr. Huffman was most cordial, publically praised Fuller and its "outstanding Faculty", and warmly invited me back next summer. One day we held a conference with a group of students who were interested in Fuller's Th.M. degree. The future was bright and rosy. Therefore, it was like a bolt of lightning from the cloudless blue sky to read that Dr. Huffman had suddenly reversed his position and decided that Fuller (and apparently myself) are heretical. What new information he acquired during the summer I have no way of knowing.

Here in Heidelberg, I am pursuing an unstructured* life consisting of reading,

*"Unstructured" is German for freedom from appointments, lectures, faculty meetings, committee meetings, conferences, speaking and preaching engagements and the like which erode one's study time.
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EDITORIALS

Student Finances:

During the opening weeks of the fall quarter the Fuller Student Fund Drive was launched to raise $5650. This sum represented the combined financial need of the Foreign Mission Fellowship, Practical Evangelism, and the Social Action Committee. These funds were delegated to support the Middler-Year-in-Missions interns—the Otto Helwegs and the Neal Neuemburgs. They were to underwrite the Mission conference, the small groups conference with Rev. Richard Halverson, and the Stringfellow conference.

Of the projected $5650 goal only about $2000 was raised in pledges. As a result the Middler-Year-in-Missions program is in jeopardy. FMF was saddled with a $900 conference bill. PE had to pare its conference expenditures to the bone and survived only through fortuitous external circumstances. SAC is currently reevaluating its conference plans.

At its last meeting in December, Student Council took note of this serious problem. They voted to make a renewed effort among those who for one reason or another did not pledge during the fall drive. Ed Dayton, a junior, was appointed to head up this program.

Financially this has been a difficult year for many students. Tuition increases always mean financial pressure on some people. The fact remains, though, that this goal of $5650 was drawn up by students representing the entire Fuller community. The total goal is our total responsibility. The opinion urges you to honestly and prayerfully reconsider your responsibility and to cooperate as you are financially able.

Coffee House Project:

In the December issue, the opinion presented the plans to have "Let's Talk Coffee Houses" in Pasadena on New Year's Eve. Now New Year's Eve has come and gone, and the plans have been carried out. We think the idea of this kind of outreach to the community is a good one, and we praise the men who originated and involved themselves in this project. Especially we would like to mention Mr. Donald Weber and Rev. George Erickson, who initiated this thing a year before it saw its fulfillment. We hope that the plans to do something more permanent with this idea will be carried through.

Vending Machines?

Prior to Christmas vacation, plans were made and publicized for the removal of the coffee bar to the coffee machines in the student lounge. The significance of this decision only struck home, however, on Monday when there was no coffee provided in the Refectory. Some students and faculty members have been disgruntled with the change. The proper means of expressing such dissatisfaction is, of course, to discuss the problem with the Student Council President, Sam Mateer and with the Business Manager, Mr. Curley. Two areas of concern have been expressed. First is the loss of community fellowship in the informal atmosphere of the Refectory. An impersonal coffee machine cannot replace Bob's and Janet's smiling faces. Secondly, the service provided to date by the vending machines has been erratic and high priced.

The Editors
Dr. Ladd Continued:

writing and listening to lectures. A staggering volume of German literature in NT Theology waits to be read. I have found in Heidelberg a new edition of a book I have been seeking for years, Adolf Schlatter's greatest work, Der Glaube im Neuen Testament, over six hundred pages, whose difficult style Prof. Käsemann of Tübingen has said contributes to the unpopularity of Schlatter among modern German theological students. A new excellent history of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages has just been published by the conservative scholar Leonhard Goppelt of Hamburg (with whom Bob Guelich is beginning his doctoral studies), which has provided a delightful and refreshing contrast to Schlatter's style. My main research project is digging more deeply into the modern tension between a Heilsgeschichte theology which sees the Bible as the inspired authoritative record and interpretation of what God has done in redemptive history, and the contemporary dialectic-existential mood which finds the Word of God only in personal address.

Production-wise, I have at last finished two long overdue articles for the revised ISBE, on "Eschatology" and "Biblical Theology," which I failed to get finished last spring. For a typewriter we have only an old (1929 model) Royal portable which severely taxes my wife's skill and patience; but she produces an amazingly good product under the circumstances. Now I am working on an introductory book for college students and curious laymen on Criticism and the Word of God. In Evangelical circles, we have too much of the thoughtless attitude, "The critics say...damn the critics" (excuse me, but this is the tone frequently heard). I am trying to spell out the necessity and validity of the various types of critical study of the Bible, which is both a product of history and the inspired Word of God. If God has been pleased to give us His Word in history, in human words, critical historical study is necessary, even while the Bible, as the Word of God, sits in judgement on me as a lost, confused sinner, disclosing to me the foolishness of my sinful wisdom and revealing to me the saving truth of God.

We have a delightful, modern, comfortable apartment about two miles from the University. (Mrs. Ladd is studying German a few hours a week from Frau Hofheinz, our landlady, as well as participating in a conversation, and in a play-reading group in the German-American Woman's Club). Parking at the University is worse than Los Angeles, so I drive half way and walk the last mile to and from. "Es ist gut für die Linie" as the Germans say. I am listening to three lectures, largely to perfect my understanding of German, which has been agonizingly slow because of my partial deafness. Prof. Kuhn is lecturing on NT Theology, Bornkamm on Exegesis of Matthew, and Tödt on "Eschatologie und Weltverantwortung," which may be very freely translated, "Eschatology and Social Ethics."

These last lectures are, for a theologian interested in the contemporary ebb and flow of German theology, exciting. Tödt is a man of about fifty who has written only one book, his doctoral dissertation, entitled Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung (1959—he was a prisoner of war for some ten years), which is a critical exegetical study of the Son of Man problem in the synoptics. Normally, a German scholar must establish himself by a series of publications before he attains the pinnacle of a university professorship, but Tödt has been projected into the prominence of a Heidelberg professorship without climbing up the usual rounds of the academic ladder. He believes like Prof. Jewett, that a theologian must be first of all an exegete, and he therefore chose to do his doctorate in New Testament studies. He also believes that theology must be related to contemporary society, which is dominated by the technological sciences. As a full fledged professor of systematic theology (in the States, he would perhaps be called Professor of Social Ethics), he
is deeply disturbed because the prevailing dialectic-existential theology has no word of social responsibility but is exclusively personal.

This contemporary theology has also reinterpreted eschatology so that it no longer is a theology of historical futurity but only of existential openness to the future. Under the constraint of a twofold conviction that theology must have a positive message relevant for contemporary society, and that such a positive word can be attained only within the perspective of a realistic, futuristic eschatology, Prof. Tödt feels himself compelled to recanvas the entire field of NT eschatology from a fresh perspective to try to discover realistic historical futurity within Christian Theology. His lectures have surveyed and criticized the ethics of Consistent Eschatology, the eschatology and ethics of the Formgeschichte Schule, the ethics of the Heilsgeschichte theology, the ethics of axiological and transcendental eschatology (Althaus, Barth, Brunner), the ethics of existential eschatology (Bultmann, et al), and the new anti-Bultmannian reaction of Pannenberg and Co.

In his own positive statement, Tödt follows a similar line of thought as that expounded in a brand new book (October, 1964) by a Bonn Professor of Social Ethics, Jürgen Moltmann, Theologie der Hoffnung (316 pages). As often happens in German Theology, here are two scholars wrestling with the same problem and coming to a similar conclusion. The kernal of Moltmann's book, and of Tödt's own position, is that the prevailing theology which believes it impossible to say anything about the future of human history is itself the product of modern philosophical presuppositions which exclude the possibility of the Biblical Theology of hope. Existential theology interprets eschatology as personal openness to the future. Moltmann responds, "It is not possible to speak of believing existence in hope and in radical openness, and at the same time to hold the 'world' to be a mechanism or a self-contained, closed complex standing objectively over against man. This causes hope to lose its identity and to become only a hope of the solitary soul imprisoned in a petrified world, the expression of a gnostic longing for salvation. The idea of openness of man is meaningless if the world itself is not open but is a closed structure. Without a cosmic eschatology, eschatological existence of man is nonsense. Christian eschatology can not be satisfied with the Kantian concept of science and reality" (p. 60). Moltmann (and Tödt) insist that Christian theology must not allow modern philosophical and scientific views to dictate the structure of Christian thinking (as, most notably, Bultmann has done). The heart of the Biblical faith is a God who speaks in history, who gives promises to his people and who therefore has a real future for human history. In light of this future, Christian theology must find a saving word and make a creative impact upon the secularistic, materialistic contemporary social structure; it must attempt to realize, so far as it is possible, the promises of the future of the reality of the present.

Not only is Prof. Tödt attempting a creative work in social ethics; he is also displaying creativity in his teaching methodology. This is reflected at two points. He has coordinated his open lectures with his advanced seminar. Three hours a week he lectures to some 250 students on Eschatology and Social Ethics. On Wednesday morning at 8 A.M. he conducts a two hour closed seminar for some 40 advanced students, which has now devoted six sessions to exegetical, theological, and sociological analysis of Romans 13:1-7, to deal with the problem of the Christian's relationship to the state.

Furthermore, in wrestling with the problem of theology in a scientific world he is seeking the cooperation of scientists. He has asked Prof. Howe, a scientist, to share both the seminar and the lectures, and to deal with the same basic problems from the point of view of the scientist. Prof. Howe is just beginning to lecture; I do not know how he will handle the subject.
I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I dare venture that this fresh study of ethics and eschatology by Tödt and Moltmann may be the beginnings of a new powerful theological movement in Germany, reflecting a growing dissatisfaction with Bultmannian existentialism and a groping for something better. I put this question to Prof. Tödt one day, and he answered, "One can hope."

In conclusion, may I turn homiletic and draw three important conclusions. First, whether one agrees or disagrees with what is going on, it is tremendously stimulating to be in an environment where Theology is really important. Tödt has been professor at Heidelberg only two years. At first he had a hearing of only fifty students; today he lectures to over two hundred and fifty. He reads his polished, compact lectures at break-neck speed (Fuller students would rebel); even German students can get down only his main points, but they are listening. Theology, if it is vital, is important in Germany.

May I reinforce this point by an allegorical illustration. Tödt's lectures have to be held in the Alta Aula, Heidelberg's largest and oldest lecture hall. It is a beautiful paneled and timbered room, furnished in carved oak, and decorated with lovely symbolic paintings. Inset in the high paneled ceiling are delightful paintings of the patronesses of the four classic disciplines: Theology with an open scroll; Medicine with a snake; Law with the sword of justice; and Philosophy or the humanities with a book of human wisdom. The point here is: Theology stands first and heads all other disciplines. In the university catalog, on the bulletin boards, theology always has the place of honor.

In America, this is not true. Germans cannot understand why our great public universities do not have faculties in theology, and why our theological faculties are usually independent schools unrelated to the broad stream of university life and culture. At this point we have something to learn from the German tradition. Theology is indeed the "queen of the sciences." Our American tradition, especially in Fundamentalist circles, is very different. At one time I was Bible teacher at a conference of Fundamentalist missionaries, whose leaders openly boasted that they had no use for theology; all they needed was the simple Word of God. And even in more sophisticated Evangelical circles, with our great contemporary emphasis on the so-called "practical" disciplines, the tendency is ever present to push theology aside in favor of more modern and relevant approaches to the Christian life. I repeat: it is invigorating to be in a climate where theology is really important.

Secondly, this incipient theological movement, represented by Professors Tödt and Moltmann, suggests to me that theology ought not to be in such constant flux and change. While these new developments have for me a certain excitement, I am reminded that I stand in a different tradition, that I am convinced that God has revealed himself in the events of redemptive history, whose meaning is interpreted by the inspired, authoritative Word of God. The Word of God assures me that God does indeed have a future for history and for the race, that the God who has been redemptively active in history will surely bring history to its divinely appointed goal in the Kingdom of God. Thus while I have a profound appreciation for the problems with which Professors Tödt and Moltmann are wrestling--and indeed I am myself wrestling with similar problems--I feel that their dilemma is aggravated by the fact that they share the presuppositions of modern philosophy to such an extent that they cannot understand revelation to be God's self-disclosure in the events of redemptive history, recorded and interpreted by the inspired Word of God. An American-type of Evangelicalism is practically non-existent in German university faculties of theology, and I fear Prof. Tödt would view my theological stance as one of rather naive Biblicism. This is a reproach which Evangelicals must be able to bear. On the other hand, ought
it not to be possible to express an Evangelical theology in fresh dynamic terms which will not sound like a reactionary obscurantism but which will meaningfully communicate to theologians standing in other modern traditions? As I see it, this is Fuller's great challenge and one of the most important reasons for which God has raised her up.

This leads directly to a third observation, which must be made lest what I have written in the last paragraph appear to be a condemnation on all who do not share my theological perspective. The gravest temptation of orthodoxy is that it become stagnant, defensive, apologetic, traditional. While I am convinced that God had communicated eternal, unchanging truth in the inspired Word of God, it remains true that the truth is far greater than our finite minds, that we cannot package it in convenient one pound chain-store style, that true scholarship must ever be motivated by an open, inquiring mind. This life-long conviction, German theology has confirmed. A defensive stance toward life and learning is inevitably stagnating, whether one defend traditional Lutheranism, Calvinism, Dispensationalism, Fundamentalism, or even Liberalism.

It would have been easy for Fuller to have been overtaken by this temptation and to have conceived of its main theological task to be the defense of a high view of inspiration. That we do hold such a high view and are unswervingly committed to it is not the point; any essentially defensive stance is stifling to real progress, whether scientific, political, or theological. We must be open to the Word of God; we must never suppose we have exhausted God's truth and therefore have nothing to learn even about such essential doctrine as that of inspiration, but need only defend traditional formulations. God's truth, our apprehension of it, and its understanding and interpretation in terms of contemporary issues and categories demand a freshness and vigor of approach which will doubtless be labeled "liberalism" by reactionary traditionalists. It is folly to try to defend a nineteenth century formulation of orthodox theology in the late twentieth century.

I am not for a moment suggesting that we abandon our firm anchorage in the revealed truth of the Word of God. I am suggesting that the Word of God is greater than any or all formulations, that our exposition ought to be flexible enough to be relevant to the issues of our own day and age. Jesus Christ is indeed the same yesterday and forever; and the Word of God can neither be broken, added to, nor subtracted from. But as theological students and men of the twentieth century, we must be open to the Word of God and not defensively bound by some particular tradition. This, I have felt, is one of the chief glories of the Fuller Theological Seminary: a community of learning, standing unswervingly upon the authoritative Word of God, yet possessing the freedom to understand and interpret the Word of God, not necessarily in terms of older traditions but in terms of the Word itself and its relevance to the mid-twentieth century.

This stance is relevant not only for the theologian but also for the minister of the Gospel, and ought to mould the kind of product we are turning out. The easiest way to be a "successful" minister in many circles is to conform comfortably to the tradition in which you find yourself, to preach and teach what people have heard for decades, in the idiom and formulations to which they are accustomed. I long to see men of God going from Fuller into the ministry—men not motivated primarily by personal ambition for success, but men completely captivated by Jesus Christ, men unswervingly committed to the Word of God and an evangelical theology, but men who can preach the saving, redeeming truth of God with a freshness, creativity, and relevance which will make them prophetic voices of God. Life can offer no greater challenge than this.
BIBLE STUDY - SOME NEW CONCEPTS
by Ronald C.

Man's Need for a God

It always has and forever shall be man's weakness to rely on others, to distribute his burden, to lessen his responsibility, to find a scapegoat. This is approximately how men use God and Jesus. We pray to God to share our burden, to lighten our load, or at least to give us faith to do the work ourselves.

Would the first Christians have had the strength to fight, to preach, and bear persecution, had they not believed that God would help them? Doesn't it give you confidence to know that whenever you work on something, some worthwhile undertaking, God will help you?

Yes, it does. Man relies pretty much on God to help him and to forgive him his sins.

What is all this leading up to? That to believe in Anything, yes anything at all, is worthwhile. To think someone is helping you, guiding you; this is worthwhile.

Confidence can be an all important factor in our lives. Confidence in ANYTHING.

Buddhism, Islam, and any other religion is none the weaker in this respect. Moslems have won many battles, along with the Greeks, Romans, and Norsemen, because of the implicit trust, FOUNDUNOED OR UNFOUNDUNOED, which they placed in their Gods.

"Yes" you say, "but these Gods couldn't perform miracles." Couldn't they? Isn't giving people faith in themselves, or at least faith in something good, a miracle?

Again you say, "Yes, but don't Christians receive actual, physical miracles?" But wait! Do we? Are we actually receiving physical miracles today? Can anybody here tell me one? One might say, "What's the matter God? Running out of miracles?" And some nut will say, "What! Do you doubt the existence of God because of lack of miracles? To believe in God you must have faith."

And what is the foundation of Islam, Buddhism, or almost any religion? FAITH.

If this is true, you might as well believe in any other religion. They are just as feasible, or INfeasible, as Christianity. We believe in God because we were brought up to believe in God. If you were born in India, I am sure that today you would be denouncing Christianity just as today all of you are denouncing Islam in your hearts. Does anyone disagree with this?

A mediator, if presented with all of the world's religions would probably find them just as illogical. That is, all except one. Do you know what it is? Does your biased mind tell you it is Christianity? No. It is Egocontrolism.

EGOCONTROLISM - MY RELIGION

(The No Nonsense, conceivable ideas that were formulated through years of doubt and indecision.)

RON C. is a 13 year old junior high student. One of our FTS students has contacted him in the course of his work in a local church. the opinion presents this paper without literary emendation for your perusal.
An insane title? Perhaps, if you knew me, you would call me insane too. You, undoubtedly, will think the same things after you read this, that you always did. You will believe that Moses split the waters of the Red Sea (if you believe that now) and that Christ healed the sick. This Religion was made for those that are sick of unexplained miracles, 900 year old men and other such phenomena.

This religion has no loopholes, patched by "miracles." This is based on good, solid thinking and reasoning. Aspects of this religion are listed for your convenience and mine.

1. What's wrong with all present day religions? First of all, too much unexplained phenomena. Too much that cannot be accounted for by science.

In the beginning of time, men could not understand much. All that he couldn't understand he attributed to gods with strange powers. Lightning, which we know today as electrons jumping as protons, was once attributed to the result of Thor using his trusty hammer, Kjolner. There was a sun god, a rain god, a war god, a god of mirth, of love, of the sea, of the hearth, of the forest, and of the harvest. Sound ridiculous? Our present religion is NOTHING MORE THAN A CONGLOMERATION OF ALL THESE GODS, PUT TOGETHER INTO SOME FORM OF SUPERGOD!

If you're finally going to admit that possibly Moses' drying up of the Red Sea just might have been an earthquake, why not admit that just maybe life came through evolution instead of Adam and Eve? That "Jesus" was maybe only a doctor or maybe he never existed at all? That Methusla only lived 100 years? 90? 80? 50? That there is no such thing as God as we think of him today?

2. How was the earth made then? One day, (I am sorry, actually there was no day than, no star has been created) something happened that no man can explain today. This is one of the only 2 faults that this religion possess. Somehow, dust was made. Then gravity (no inexplicable mysterious, miracle) slowly pulled these particles together. Larger balls attracted smaller ones until gigantic masses formed. These masses threw off tiny sparks which became the stars, asteroids, moons, and planets. One of these planets was the Earth. The Earth cooled sending up gases. These gasses condensed, and rain fell. When the oceans were done, the scene was set for the entrance of the first one-celled creature. IN THE NEXT 1000 YEARS OR THE NEXT 100,000 YEARS MAN WILL BE ABLE TO CREATE LIFE. FOR LIFE WAS CREATED BY CERTAIN CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES ACCIDENTLY PUT TOGETHER IN EXACTLY THE RIGHT COMBINATION OF AND OTHER FACTORS.

Through evolution, the one-celled animals progressed through man. Seven days!!! Humph!

3. What are the possible limitations of what a true god or deity could be? I reasoned that it would either be of some material and mass or completely non-existent. As astronomers can find no trace of a heaven, and science lists no invisible and living bodies, there is obviously no god in heaven. Depth probes and radio wave-soundings CAN FIND NO TRACE OF A HELL. This also tends to prove my theory. Then if god is immaterial, what is he/she/it?

Here are the qualifications for a god:

1. Must speak absolute truth and preach good, not evil.
2. Need not perform miracles.
3. Must be able to communicate with you.
4. Need not be material.
Your Conscience

Your conscience speaks to you. It could, if you followed its orders exactly, make you a perfect person. Every time you do something that your conscience tells you to do, you make yourself stronger. There could have been a person like Jesus and there could be one today. YOU COULD BE ONE. Jesus was supposedly a perfect person. You could be a perfect person by doing everything your conscience says. The old saying "let your conscience be your guide" is the very heart of this religion.

In Christianity, God's temple is in our mind. This is so in my religion. The only trouble is, in Christianity the issue is so clouded by miracles, heaven, hell, prophets, Holy Ghosts and other such questionable phenomena, that the true fact is obscured.

How and what got e started on this discovery? I did not want to model myself to a fairy tale. Some day, if god's existence and the existence of the Christ and prophets is proved, I will be the first one to return to Christianity. Don't think it's pleasant to be ½ atheist. But I am what you Christians would call a Doubting Thomas as I believe only what I see.

Back in 6th grade, I wanted something. I wanted it very badly I prayed to God that I would receive this thing I wanted. I realized this as wrong, and I realize that today. Yet I was so disappointed that I began thinking if there really was a God at all. After 2 years of thought, I arrived at the conclusions you have read.

THINK: CAN YOU COME UP WITH A BETTER SOLUTION????????????????

THE END: FIRST TESTAMENT: ST. RON'S VERSION

MY FATHER IS DEAD, AND HE DIDN'T EVEN LEAVE ANY LIFE INSURANCE

(Sung to: "My Bonnie Lies Over the Ocean")

Oh, God is like a fortress,
Armed with bean-shooters he stands.
The rest of his fearsome arsenal,
Is composed of rubber bands.

CHORUS
Bring back, bring back, oh bring
Back my Father to me, to me.
Bring back, bring back, oh bring
Back my Father to me.

If you still aren't scared of Father,
He's got magic powers as well.
He'll point his finger right at you,
And whisk you off to hell.

CHORUS

While not working on some miracle,
God is having some fun.
Without a wife or mistress,
He somehow produced a son.

CHORUS
Instead of protecting His fortress,
With a miracle, match-gun or psalm.
He should try to up-date his religion,
Or get wiped out by an atom bomb.

CHORUS

He isn't concerned with His image,
All he's concerned with is sin,
So while He's in Heaven Judging,
EGOCONTROLISM shall win.

CHORUS

Throwout, throwout, throwout all
Notions of Him, of Him,
Set Him, on your shelf, between
Anderson and Grimm.

A Book Review by Dr. Paul K. Jewett

Few books contain really new ideas and perhaps it would be too much to say this
one does, for it is obsessed with the hundred year old idea of evolution. Yet no one
has ever surveyed the implications of this idea for the future of man with the scope
and daring vision of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Most books perish with their times
but these essays, twenty-one in all, are more relevant now than when they were written.
For sure Teilhard is no orthodox theologian; he is a mystic and a scientist, a combi­
nation which makes for lots of inchoate heresy, but there is never a dull moment and
there are no barren passages.

One might ask why we have been so long in hearing about Teilhard. One obvious
reason is, his ideas were suppressed by the Roman hierarchy of his day; also he wrote
in French(Protestant theologians are accustomed to look to German books for original
thinking)and his French is formidable. A special word of appreciation is due, there­
fore, to the translator of this composite volume, Mr. Norman Denny. Even in English
such words as "noogenesis" and "noosphere", "unanimisation", "organicity of the univ­
erse", "para-biological epi-phenomenon", "hominisation", "compacity" and the like
spoil one's progress in speed reading.

In a word Teilhard's thought is that once we have perceived ourselves and all
our universe as moving, we can no more speak statistically of cosmology and biology
and anthropology, but must think in terms of cosmogenesis (the evolution of the cosmos),
biogenesis (the proliferation of the tree of life), and anthropogenesis, that is the
ultra-socializing of humanity turning in on itself by virtue of the explosion of
population and the sphericity of our planet. The science of sociology, then, is really
an elaboration of biology and Teilhard's word for it is "anthropogenesis" or more
often "noogenesis". But man cannot be an end in himself. Secular science has regarded
this problem of the irreversible character of the evolutionary process with averted
glance assuming man has millions of years before the physical system runs out in the
cold death. But this turns men into a living fossil which is after all but a form of
death and cuts the nerve of the psychic mechanism of evolution. Teilhard's suggestion
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is a paroxysm in the noosphere which he calls "Christogenesis", the culmination of the whole evolutionary process. The word paroxysm is as near as he comes to the language of the catastrophic and apocalyptic with which the New Testament paints the parousia of Christ. Ordinarily he thinks of millions of years for this event to be achieved. Indeed the radical difference between the vertical, punctiliar view of the second advent in the New Testament and the slow horizontal connotation of the word "evolution", is perhaps the most perplexed aspect of Teilhard's thinking about the future of mankind for a Christian theologian. Apparently evolution will bring in the "fullness of time" when, in a way beyond imagining, mankind, become fully human in Christ, will transcend the present cosmic system that God may be all in all. The reader should especially consult chapter xviii, "The Heart of the Problem".

* * *

URBANA, '64
by Paul Balisky

"Now those of you who want to dedicate your lives to missionary work at home or abroad, please stand." Nearly all of the 7,500 students stood to their feet. Billy Graham was giving the invitation at the close of his sermon. But were these young leaders of tomorrow really serious in making such a commitment? Maybe they were merely responding to an emotionally charged sermon on this final night of the four-day convention. Were they intellectually persuaded by a battery of panelists such as Clyde Taylor, Warren Webster, Arthur Glasser, Eugene Nida, Dit Fenton, Don Smith, Paul Little, Kenneth Kantzer, Ruth Lewis, Samuel Moffat, or P.T. Chandipilla? Did the passionate and energetic sermon delivered with a Latin-American accent by Reuben Lores convince them? Maybe it was John R. Stott's scholarly Biblical Exposition? Why did they stand? Were they really counting the cost? They were at the memorial service Monday night. Didn't they hear the names of dozens of young American and Canadian missionaries who paid the supreme price? Didn't these young people hear Dr. Paul Carlson's tape recorded words coming softly over the loudspeakers in the Assembly Hall "...in this century more people have died for Christ than died in the early centuries, which we think of as the days of martyrs."

Yes, God spoke to scores of students that night. And their commitment was going to be put into action. Three students, as we rode back together on the same bus shared with me their commitment. A class officer from Westmont College became convicted of his "I-could-care-less" attitude toward destructive pranksters on campus. He was going to give positive leadership to curb such activity and attempt to set a positive tone on campus.

A graduate student from UCLA was convinced that God's place for him was back in Yugoslavia where he was born. But how could he get back into Communist Yugoslavia? He must go on and get his Ph.D. in physics. As a professor he could go to his homeland and be a witness for Christ.

And then there was the young enthusiastic sophomore from Long Beach State. He could hardly wait to get back on campus to witness to students who did not know Christ. He said he was going to tell one student each day about Christ.

Yes, Urbana, '64 meant commitment for many. But as I reflect on the four days of the convention two things come into sharp focus. First, men and women outside of Jesus Christ are looking for reality that will bring meaning and purpose to life.
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They seek reality in such diverse activities as burning embassies, race riots, and burning to death on a pyre. In America this quest for meaning is expressed in other peculiar forms. It is imperative that we Christians reveal the reality of Christ by a consistent walk and a coherent witness.

The second thing that hit me with real force is that there are more people in the world today who have not heard of Jesus Christ than had heard of Him ten years ago. If the Church around the world is going to cope with the population explosion it must make a united effort in evangelization. Could it be that God the Holy Spirit has raised up a program of evangelism in Latin America called Evangelism-in-Depth that would be feasible for the Church in other countries. I wonder.

* * *

THE COFFEE HOUSE IN RETROSPECT by Michael Halleen

The Coffee House project began small, grew tremendously in size and enthusiasm during the planning stages, and diminished considerably by New Year's Eve. Some 15 locations were to be used; four actually opened their doors. 180 qualified conversation leaders and program directors were to take part; one house saw 3:15 a.m. pass with 50 young people present and scarcely a Christian witness to be heard, though two "spiritualists" plied their trade to a handful of listeners.

To those who did take part, however, the night was not entirely fruitless. This writer can testify of one young man who earnestly rededicated his life to Christ after some years apart from the Church, including recent time in jail. Another received the gift of salvation of which he had known nothing previously and was plainly, though undramatically, born again. Contact with the world in any form is good, even essential to the Church's mission. Thus the whole idea of the coffee house was an excellent one, and none can dispute that it was a legitimate attempt to bring the Church to the world. Any criticism of it must be qualified by the consideration that at least something was being done. Moreover, publicity was excellent, and the response of young people to the opportunities for conversation was remarkable, even when the topics turned to the "ultimate" matters.

But the expressed purpose of the churches involved ought to have been more frankly evangelical and the efforts of the majority of discussion leaders less wishy-washy. The Church does not make itself relevant by serving coffee and providing table games. Its relevance is in its message, that men are lost and dying and Jesus Christ alone can give them salvation. Teen-agers and collegians do not shrink from a right presentation of this "ultimate" matter; they welcome it.

However, a beginning has been made. If the program can continue and develop and grow, concerning itself more with a personal presentation of the gospel, it could become one of the best tools of the churches in this community.

* * *
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