"...now we are often puzzled by ourselves, others, and God himself..."

1. If I speak with the tongues of Graham and of Marshall, but have not love, I am as welcome as a morning alarm or a horn at a stoplight.
2. And if I can make alarmingly accurate pronouncements and resolve all biblical 'contradictions' and know the Novum Testamentum Graece thoroughly (including textual notes), and if I have all faith so as to remove mountains of assignments, but have not love, I am absolutely nothing.
3. If I tithe three times over and feel the pinch from the Fuller Fund, and if I am raked over the coals by non-Christians (and Christians less orthodox than I), but have not love, I gain not one iota.
4. A seminary student is patient with classmates who ask unscholarly questions in lectures and who are slow, and kind to those who have no time for his problems; he is not jealous of students to whom studies come easily; neither is he boastful of the good grades he has received (upon occasion) nor of the number of people he has led to Christ.
5. He is not arrogant toward professors whose ideas he questions and whose teaching ability troubles him, nor is he ever rude to the Sessor girls, but acts as a true gentleman in the refectory. A seminary student does not insist on his own hermeneutical conclusions. He does not get irritated at reserve book regulations and refectory food, nor does he resent the constructive criticism in homiletics class and suggestions offered by his wife or roommate.
6. A seminary student does not rejoice (even inside) when a classmate does worse than he on an exam, but rejoices with him when he does well.
7. A seminary student bears much misunderstanding and gossip in his field work, gives the benefit of the doubt to others, refuses to let failure as a student and as a Christian get him down, has confident expectation in his studies and labor, endures seemingly unjust assignments without griping.
8. A seminary student's love never ends. As for his insight, it will falter; as for his homiletical eloquence, it will fade; and as for his knowledge it will appear meager.
9. For our knowledge of God's mysteries is imperfect, and our ability to tell people solutions to their problems is imperfect.
10. But when the perfect comes, the imperfect will pass away.
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Next Tuesday, November 8, is election day in California. It is becoming increasingly apparent to us as Christians that we have serious responsibilities in relation to our government. The following selections are presented to help awaken our own sense of responsibility and to help us more clearly to see the urgency of this hour.

"If you want love and cooperation in any kind of society... it is necessary to sacrifice some freedom for its sake. What strange fanatics these moderns are! Imagining themselves dispassionate in their evaluation of all values, they are really bigoted protagonists of the one value of freedom. Every other value must be subordinated to it."

Reinhold Niebuhr

"Democracy as a constitutional procedure for the establishment of government is a political form which embraces a great variety of methods... Democracy as a way of life which does justice to the dignity of every human being is the basic principle of political ethics. But it may be that democracy in the latter sense can be realized only by a limitation or transformation of democracy in the first sense... Christianity must not identify itself with any particular political form, whether feudalism or bureaucratic patriarchalism or democracy. It cannot sanction democratic forms which disguise the destruction of community and personality."

Paul Tillich

"... the judgment of God on our institutions and policies is a perpetual warning against the idolatry of nations, of NATO, of the West, of all things that we tend to set up as special matters of concern, and I think there is a dimension here which doesn't come from reason either; but given the Christian understanding of the God of history we can see how this does correct our natural tendency to make absolute that which is close to us and which we prize."

John C. Bennett

"Rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of him who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good."

St. Paul (Romans 13:3-4a)

"Almighty God, who dost hold us to account for the use of all our powers and privileges: Guide, we pray Thee, the people of these United States in the election of their rulers and representatives; that by wise legislation and faithful administration the rights of all may be protected, and our nation be enabled to fulfill Thy purposes; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Book of Common Worship

RAB
13 AND THE SEMINARY STUDENT (continued)

11. When I was a child I spoke brokenly, I thought naively, and reasoned poorly. But now that I am a seminary student I put these behind.

12. For now we are often puzzled by ourselves, others, and God himself, but these all will become clear. Now I know in part, but then I shall understand, even as He has fully understood me and the eternal significance of all I say, feel, think, and do.

13. So faith, hope, and love abide, these three; but the one that really counts, both now and always, is love.

////

A CRITICAL VIEW OF "A CONSERVATIVE VIEW OF THE MORAL LIMITS OF GOVERNMENT"
by Gene Terpstra

"The basic problem... is its oversimplification of issues."

Mr. Talbot succeeded admirably, with me at least, in his professed desire "to stimulate discussion" through part iv of his "Conservative View." In fact, I am stimulated to the point of taking time off from studying for Hermeneutics to write a reply. Although the first three sections are more coherent than the last, there are a few curious observations (generalizations and innuendo) that deserve comment. However, I will limit my comments to part iv, not only because of its admitted lack of precision, but also because of the other weaknesses it contains.

The lack of precision does not result from the variety of subjects considered, as Mr. Talbot asserts, but rather from failure to use terms specifically and unambiguously and from failure to develop a coherent argument. Some of the terms, such as "welfare mentality," "very extreme poverty," "welfare programs," "the demands of the market," and "ultimate (economic) solution," which are important in his discussion and to the conclusions he implies, are neither defined nor used clearly in context. If the reader is allowed to provide his own meanings for the terms, Mr. Talbot is no longer in control of his argument, to say nothing of the conclusions he hopes to draw. But beyond the different terms he uses, there are several statements that need to be qualified or clarified. One is the observation that "the conservative does not oppose every welfare program on principle" (p. 10). While this is doubtless true of many conservatives, it is perhaps least true for the more prominent spokesmen for conservatism. The best known is ex-senator Goldwater, mentioned earlier in Mr. Talbot's article. As was made abundantly clear during the last presidential campaign by publicity given Mr. Goldwater's voting record and positions cited from his own speeches and writings, he did in fact oppose virtually every welfare program as a matter of principle. Other senators and congressmen still in office run a close second in their negativeism on social and welfare legislation, a fact easily verified by checking the ratings given by various conservative organizations to congressmen's voting records. On page 11 Mr. Talbot concedes the inhumanity and inconvenience of immediate solutions (apparently this means unrestrained operation of the market) to economic problems. However, it is not clear how the desired "ultimate solution" differs from the immediate solution, since it also seems to be predicated on the continuous...
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unrestrained - by government, at least - operation of the market and would thus have the same inhuman consequences.

Because I wish to comment closely on Mr. Talbot's closing remarks, I will take the liberty of repeating them here.

He [the Conservative] not only objects to the unethical extension of the powers of the state, but also to the tenacious rigidity with which modern Liberals resist almost all economic changes; and he views interventionism in general, and massive welfare and poverty programs in particular, as an indication of the Liberal's basic unwillingness to submit to the demands of the market. The Liberal has, in effect, taken a flight from reality, and in his attempt to defeat the market he continues to place tyrannical power in the hands of the government, stifling individual initiative, and rendering the ideal of John Stuart Mill forever unattainable. (p. 11)

Admittedly, this is a powerful passage, but does its power derive from logical or from emotional appeal? Consider the following words and phrases: "unethical," "tenacious rigidity," "massive" (welfare and poverty programs), "unwillingness to submit," "flight from reality," "attempt to defeat the market," "tyrannical power," "stifling individual initiative," "ideal," and "forever unattainable." Though an analysis of the connotations would be interesting, I am concerned with the ideas presented here. As a matter of fact, liberals do not resist almost all economic changes. Such changes are a very important goal of many of the welfare and poverty programs initiated by liberals. They do, however, oppose, or at least seek to control, the kind of economic changes that would be effected by unrestrained free enterprise. Another ostensible liberal shortcoming here is refusal to submit to the demands of the market. If the unrestrained market is in view here, this would seem to be a virtue rather than a fault. In the history of free enterprise, whenever and wherever the market has been really free, there have usually been detrimental effects ranging from inconvenience to viciousness. In a short space it would be impossible to give a definitive list and examples of these effects, but several categories can be noted.

Cutthroat competition, leading to survival of the fittest (i.e., the most powerful or most ruthless). Monopolies - in pricing as well as in production. Price fixing (a recent exposure embarrassed most of America's prominent electrical companies). Industry's refusal to eliminate practices which create health hazards, such as smog, smoke and industrial "fallout," water pollution, etc. A colloquial equivalent of the phrase, "the demands of the market," and a more frank statement of its implications, is the expression, "whatever the market will bear." A recent study in Los Angeles illustrates this principle in action. It was found that the stores where the poorer people in minority groups made their purchases charged exorbitant prices for their merchandise. The prices far exceeded those that would be found by adding credit charges to the normal selling price; in fact, the total cost of an item for these persons often was more than twice the amount a middle-class customer would have to pay for the item where he buys. It may be objected that many of the preceding examples do not properly illustrate the working of the market because competition is missing. However, in the absence of government "interference" with the free market, there is little to prevent the preceding examples from becoming the rule rather than the exception. The closing words of the quoted passage lament that John Stuart Mill's ideal is unattainable. Perhaps this unfulfillment is unfortunate, but it is difficult to say one way or the other until one knows what Mill's ideal is. The opening of part iv quotes Mill, but that statement is negative and furnishes an ideal only by a tenuous inference. The quotation which follows does not specifically state an ideal either, and the publica-
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tion date of its source does not suggest that it is from Mill. Accordingly, judgment as to whether it is good or bad that Mill’s ideal is unattainable will have to wait at least until it is known just what that ideal is.

Perhaps the essence of the foregoing criticism of Mr. Talbot’s closing remarks can be given by repeating his observations, but with changes in wording so that they reflect the liberal point of view. With apologies to Mr. Talbot, here it is.

He [the liberal] not only objects to the unethical extension of the powers of free enterprise, but also to the tenacious rigidity with which modern conservatives resist almost all social changes; and he views non-interventionism in general, and defense of the individual rights of the economically successful in particular, as an indication of the conservative’s basic unwillingness to let the economic minority gain influence in the market. The conservative has, in effect, taken a flight from moral responsibility, and in his attempt to keep the minority defeated he continues to place tyrannical power in the hands of the economic majority, preventing the individual rights of many, and rendering the ideals of the Bill of Rights forever unattainable.

I should clarify some of my terms, especially since I am putting them in another’s context. The economic minority is usually the racial minority also, but this is not accidental. The discrimination, unemployment, cultural deprivation, etc., which attend minority groups are a major cause of their weakness as an economic force. They are a definite factor in the market, for they too must buy products and services, but they are its victims rather than an influence. The incident noted above concerning overcharging the poor is one illustration of this. The plea here is not that the rights of the economic majority (businesses and the middle class) be sacrificed to provide privileges for the minority. (The opposite of this is closer to being true today.) Neither is it to give the minority enough welfare help to enable them to become members of the majority. The liberal’s desire is, rather, that society seek to change the social and political conditions that keep the economic minority in their non-competitive minority status through preventing the exercise of their rights. When and if they are able to exercise their social and political rights without restraint, as most of the rest of society is able to do, they will also gain economic status and influence, and through the same processes that the economic majority gains them. The necessary changes cannot come simply through laws of government, although they can be initiated this way, and such laws are enforceable. To effect such changes, the voluntary efforts of society and business are required as well as those of government. This belief the liberal shares with the conservative. The important difference is that the liberal is not sure that society will ever voluntarily work for these changes, and he is not willing to wait for such an eventuality.

The basic problem with part iv is its oversimplification of issues. Near the beginning Mr. Talbot remarks that welfare "does not remove the economic problem underlying poverty" (p. 10). This is true, not only because welfare cannot replace personal income for the poor, but also because economics is not the only problem underlying poverty. As the foregoing paragraph has shown, poverty (and the economic problem itself) results from more basic social and political problems of the economic minority. Oversimplification is also evident in the way the free market and government intervention are characterized in part iv. They appear to be absolutes; the former is all good and the latter is all bad. Earlier in his article, Mr. Talbot cited man's sinful
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nature as one justification for the existence of government; government is necessary to regulate society. To be consistent, though, Mr. Talbot must admit that man is no less sinful when operating in economic matters than he is when operating in social matters. Incorporating or going into business is not shown in scripture as a means of overcoming man's sinful nature. In fact, a case could be made for the opposite, or at least for the fact that one's sins in business have more far-reaching effects and perhaps incur less direct (social) liability. Accordingly, the market cannot go unrestrained any more than government or human nature can. Government and the market are both sinful institutions, just like the nature of man. Because of their somewhat divergent interest, society fares best when there is a balance of power between them, not when one or the other ceases to function. However, if they are absolutes as section iv indicates, and if Mr. Talbot is suggesting to us, "Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve," I am afraid that I would have to side with the government. The profit motive gives rise to an ingenuity that is without peer in human activity, even in the machinations of politics. The market mentality can never be stopped completely, even when efforts are directed specifically to that end. Communism in eastern European countries has had to acknowledge this by modifying parts of its system to allow for a degree of free enterprise.

The quotation with which the article closes provides a noble criterion for judging the virtue of a government, but it has nothing to do with Mr. Talbot's own remarks except perhaps by implication. He has not shown that the government in view in his discussion "dwarfs its men" either in its intent or in its practices, so it cannot qualify as the bad government described in the closing quotation. Equally important is his failure to show that the government of his remarks has not tried to develop its human resources, so it cannot be disqualified as the good government described in the quotation. In fact, some of the very activities Mr. Talbot criticizes would be considered by some to be the government's attempts to develop human resources. The final quotation, then, neither adds to nor concludes his argument. However, the standards underlying its comments about government are values to which a liberal would readily subscribe.

1. Farther on Mr. Talbot talks about the farm subsidies, but this cannot be what he means by "welfare programs" since that practice is too restricted in scope to bear the weight of his general criticism (actual and implied) of government "interference" with the market.

2. The author says that "some would deem inhuman" (emphasis mine) the economic solutions afforded by an unrestrained market. This wording is curious. It suggests that the "devastating effect" of a completely free market may not really be inhuman at all; i.e., whether or not it is inhuman is only a matter of opinion. Who besides the victims of such a market - feel that it is inhuman? I hope that it is not only the liberals who are opposed to such economic freedom (oppression), but also the Christians, whatever their political views, because they oppose any form of oppression and its consequent suffering.
THE GAME THAT WE ARE PLAYING

by Dale W. Fredrikson

"... Jesus says, 'Disciple.' This is the goal; there is no other."

Far too many years the evangelical church has been sending out missionaries, and in doing so thinking that it has been fulfilling the commission of Jesus Christ. Many a year the local churches have had their missionary emphasis week to encourage their young people to go to the foreign mission field. Many a preacher and missionary have quoted the right verses: "Go and teach all nations...", "Go into all the world and proclaim the gospel to every creature." And they have been going, and they have been preaching and teaching and making converts, and building church buildings. I thank God for those who have gone, and for those He has seen fit to, because of their going, give new life. For Paul's observation that people cannot believe unless they have heard, is as true today as it was in his day. But the problem is that in going and making converts and in building churches we are not fulfilling the great commission. The goal has not been reached, and if the game were still in progress, and we were progressing toward the goal, things would not be so bad. But we are not even headed in the right direction. We are, as it were, running back and forth across the field from one side line to the other. We definitely are very vigorous, but we are not getting closer to the goal. Do not think that it is any different for the pastor here than for the missionary there. (In fact, this might be more applicable to us here at home, than to those who have left.) The goal is the same. We all agree that the goal is the same; the matter of geography does not change the goal. Furthermore there are not two goals: one for the layman, and one for the missionary and pastor and other "full time" workers. No! There is one goal. The professor at seminary, the teacher at Bible school, the Sunday School teacher, the I.V. and CCC worker, the Christian student and business man have the same goal in front of them. The role is different for each, but the goal is the same. One is, so to speak, the quarterback, some the ends, some the backfield men, and some the line men. But the goal for all is the same, or had better be if anything like winning the game is to be approached. But I fear that the problem is the same for all. The goal is not in mind. It is in sight, but not in mind, and all of us are running back and forth across the field from side line to side line. You don't agree? Very well, let me illustrate. Write down on a piece of paper (one that you won't throw away) what the goal is. Don't look for it anywhere. Write it down out of your head. And don't change it. NO, STOP! Don't read any further, Write down the goal; come on!

Now when you get a chance, compare with others. It will, I think, be quite illuminating. But don't change it, and don't be bashful. Remember that this is an experiment; its purpose is to gain information.

Now after that little experiment—the results of which I don't know but do suspect, and you will know—let's go on.

The translators of the King James and the ASV and even the RSV have done the church a great disservice in the way they have translated the aorist participles in Mt. 28:19 and Mk. 16:15 by the English imperative. In each case the word translated by the English "go" is the aorist participle "poreuthentes" and not the imperative. The imperative is another word elsewhere. Mt. 28:19 could be better translated,
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"When you have gone..." could be also translated 'going' or even perhaps 'wherever you are'. In any case it is an aorist participle and the action of the verb is indefinite. One may still be going, or one may be well established in some community, but that is irrelevant. The fact is that one will be going from the spot of commissioning, and when he does he has a command to obey, a commission to fulfill: "Disciple."

"Disciple." This is the only imperative in the whole verse. And it is an imperative. Now in order to make disciples we have to know what a disciple is, and we will speak of that a bit later. Who are we to disciple? "All nations", or perhaps even closer "all ethnic groups." We are to disciple every ethnic group, every cultural enclave: the tribe, the college intellectual, the high school dropout, the rich, the poor, the migrant worker, the aero-space technician. Jesus Christ does not say go so much; he says, "Disciple." The goal is not going, but discipling; not converting, but discipling; not making churches (big or little), but discipling; not getting money, but discipling; not even evangelizing, but discipling. The goal, mind you, not the method, is discipling.

Graciously Jesus does not give a command without telling us how to go about it. The next two participles are present. That means that they are contemporaneous with the main verb. We disciple by baptizing, and by teaching. Apart from all the symbols that have been drawn from the sacrament of baptism, the emphasis here seems to be the following: after God has graciously produced new spiritual life in a man, he already belongs to, and is a part of the very body of Jesus Christ. Baptism serves to symbolize this, this immersion into the body; but it also serves as recognition and acceptance by the local church, because of God's own acceptance. The first step in discipling, then, is the inclusion of the new born man into the local expression of the body to which he already belongs. I say this is the first step because in a very real sense new birth is a work of God which we play only a small part.

The second step in discipling, and by far the most important, is teaching. Now we did not say talking, or preaching, or encouraging, or exhorting, or pressuring, or compelling; we said teaching. That is, changing their behavior patterns. Not just giving them new information, but causing them to live in a new way. What are we to be teaching them? "Teaching them to obey." To obey, mind you, not to know or to understand, but to obey. Teaching them obedience. Teaching them to obey what, you ask? Teaching them to obey "EVERYTHING, as much as I commanded you." Not just a few select commands, but every single one. Not how to become money raisers, or deacons, or Sunday School teachers (which are rules, not the goal), but how to be obedient to all the commands of Jesus.

Obedience, you say, is so hard. Granted. Did anyone say that the goal was easy? But that makes no difference. The goal remains: obedience. Paul says, "For I will not venture to speak of anything except what Christ has wrought through me to win OBEDIENCE from the Gentiles." (Rom. 15:18 RSV) And in the last part of chapter sixteen Paul says, "Now to him who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel and
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the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages, but is now disclosed, and through the prophetic writings is made known to all nations, according to the command of the eternal God, to bring about OBEDIENCE to the faith." Discipleship is obedience.

To the disciples Jesus said, "Disciple, by teaching them to obey everything." Now it seems pretty obvious that only a disciple can teach another man how to be a disciple. Only one who is already obeying the commands of Jesus can teach another how to obey. What does that say to us? We who are going to be responsible for leadership in the churches of the very near future. Well, quite simply, that we must be disciples. How much do we know about being a disciple, about honest obedience to all the commands of Jesus? How many of the commands of Jesus can you list right now? Go ahead, try it. (I won't ask you how many you are in the habit of obeying.) Unless we wish to perpetuate the assembly of newborns who have never grown up, of converts who have never been taught discipleship, we must ourselves learn to be true disciples. We must be disciples, so that we can teach others to be disciples, so that they in turn can teach others to be disciples, who also will be able to disciple. For we need not even leave this verse to find one of the commands that we are to "teach to obey." Jesus says, "Disciple." This is the goal; there is no other. Everything must be subservient to this. All going and coming, all preaching and exhorting, all discussing and proving must have as its ultimate end the producing of disciples. There is no other goal. Discipleship is the goal. Obedience is the goal. Discipleship is Obedience. 

* *

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. CURLEY

Pasadena, California
October 28, 1966

Mr. Richard D. Curley
Business Manager
Fuller Theological Seminary
Pasadena, California

Dear Mr. Curley:

The Social Concerns Committee of our school is frequently moved to speak and act on matters in which injustice and inequities are perpetrated on persons and groups of persons outside our Seminary community. It has recently come to our attention, however, that such a situation exists upon our own campus. We refer, of course, to the recent decision by your office to charge a few members of the student body a "parking fee" to help cover the cost of rising expenses in the operation of the Seminary.

We wish to express our concern over the fact that a few persons are being asked to bear the burden which rightly should be shared by all the members of the student body. We also wish to express concern over the mounting sense of hostility and ill
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feelings which could, if ignored, lead to an unfortunate situation.

We therefore request that you reconsider your stand on this issue, and make a
serious attempt, in cooperation with members of the Administration and the Student
Government, to find an equitable arrangement whereby all members of the Fuller com­

cc. Dr. D. Hubbard, President
Dr. D. Fuller, Dean
Mr. D. Avery, President Student Council
The Opinion
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THE BROOK
by Richard A. Bower

The twinkling glare
which endlessly changes,
moving, jostling,
Bouncing from rock to rock,
submerged in foam
or caressed gently by smooth contours.
Now blinding, now soft--
thy light entrancing,
an hypnotic spell--
My gaze leaves only with regret.

Thy sound is music sweet
when thy sounds meet
my longing ears
all music stops but thine.
The rich, sonorous call
which from thy bosom sings forth
With joyous treble
playfully engaging the thunderous bass
of pounding rocks.

Thy light, thy sound
can only compare
with richest beauty of thy bed--
so subtly clothed in liquid garb--
A mosaic nothing could create
but thy persistent flow.
Here bright and clear,
there vague, dream-like.
But always changing,
ever more beautiful than before.

What you could tell us
if you would,
or if we would hear.
You have known storms--
your eroded beds show
the rage of ruthless torrents.
You have known drought
when flowers which grace your sides
have burned away.
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But still you flow
never more confident,
ever more calm.
As if yesterday were today,
and tomorrow, yesterday,
all the same.
Your memory lives in the comfort
that now is the time.
The time is now,
your bed is made,
your flow is sure.
There only remains the question,
'whither goest thou?'

*     *     *
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