WORSHIP AND COMMUNITY AT FULLER SEMINARY

"To deny or deemphasize the corporate nature of our worship of God is to deny or deemphasize the corporate nature of our bond in Christ."

Dietrich Bonhoeffer begins his remarkable work *Life Together* with the saying "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity" (Ps. 133:1). Indeed, how pleasant this is! But who among us has really known the shattering force of this kind of community? Who among us is even seeking this kind of community? Are not our efforts usually spread over the vast maize of desirable deeds and pompous programs so that we neglect the one thing most needful?

Here indeed is the tragedy of the usual type of Christian community: that everyone has his plan, his scheme for unity and community—schemes that cancel each other out! This fact, I propose, is our problem here at Fuller.

Leaving aside for the moment any question of the priority of community over other worthy aims, let us examine what we really conceive Christian community to be. Some would have us believe that if we could only generate a warm evangelistic zeal, community would immediately follow; for is not our bond that of the common task of spreading the gospel? Some would direct us to the need for a vibrant fellowship in which the glad sounds of song, sharing and testimony gleefully resound to the fact of our common state of redemptive bliss. Others would tell us that honesty is the key which unlocks our isolation, so that we may
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be bound together through openness. (But who of us feels drawn to another when he truly comes to know what the other one is like?) Some stress theology and orthodoxy as the basis for unity, while others—the "popish element"—say that the source of unity and community is found in worship and the sacraments.

We find other factors in our centrifugal milieu at Puller. First, there is the diversity of backgrounds and traditions represented in our student body and faculty. The diversity of our religious and educational backgrounds offers both an attractive environment for social and educational growth and our most serious hurdle toward any kind of unity or community. Secondly, there are great varieties of goals represented in our student body. Pastoral ministry, youth work, teaching, scholarship, draft dodging: these are our future goals, or at least they offer some reason for our being here. Thirdly, and this follows from the second point, there is a great diversity of interests represented in our Seminary. There is a strong anti-intellectual movement among some students. There is an equally strong intellectual interest among other students. And there are all shades in between. There are the glossolalics (the neo-montanists) and the liturgiacs (the neo-romanists) And there are the activists and non-activists.

When we look at the great variety of competing interests, goals, and programs represented on our campus, we do well to wonder how we can realize any kind of distinctively Christian community. In fact we have not realized this: our community is based essentially on the same criterion as any secular community—self-interest!

Let us consider the need for community. Not all at Puller urgently feel a need for any greater degree of community than we now possess. "After all, we have our churches, our friends, our wives, our pets, etc," the argument goes. As we have seen, not all even agree as to what Christian community is. How, then are we to face these problems?

Bonhoeffer states that the question of community is not open to us. "Christianity means community..." (p. 27). The question is not whether or not we will have community, it is a matter of what kind of community we will be. Bonhoeffer states that Christian community is community "through Jesus Christ and in Jesus Christ." This means that a Christian needs others because of Christ, and that he comes to others only through Christ. He goes on to say that Christian community is not an ideal, but a divine reality. Christian community does not spring from a wish-dream. God's grace inevitably shatters such dreams, for "God is not a God of the emotions but the God of truth. Only that fellowship which faces such disillusionment...begins to be what it should be in God's sight..." (p. 27)

Also, Christian community is a spiritual not a human reality. "The basis of all spiritual reality is the clear, manifest Word of God in Jesus Christ. The basis of all human reality is the dark, turbid urges and desires of the human mind." (p. 31)

Another way of saying what Bonhoeffer has said is that community is worship. It is a kind of standing over against God in which we are judged and found wanting. In this judgment we are brought face to face with the reality of God's grace in Christ, a reality that alone forms the basis of our community. The egotism of individualism finds no place in Christian worship or community. The judgement and grace which we face
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in the act of worship or in the act of being a community cannot be fully
or even primarily met in the isolation of our inward beings. To worship
God is to see that we all have been judged and forgiven in Christ. It
is by nature of the common source of our redemption that we are drawn
inescapably together to express our unity in worship and praise. To
deny or deemphasize the corporate nature of our worship of God is to
deny or deemphasize the corporate nature of our bond in Christ.

But if true Christian community is a worshiping community, and if
ture worship emphasizes the unity and bond of our community, what then
is the mode and end of our worship? Whatever we may say about the form
of our worship, it is important that we affirm the raison d'être, the
end of our worship—God! This seems elementary, but a casual glance at
our "worship" habits at Fuller would show that God is anything but the
end of our worship. Man is the measure of our success! It's "how we
feel," or "what we get out of the experience" that is the determining
factor of our worship. We dare to guide our worship by consensus.
(Alas, we even vote on what kind of "worship" we like best.) We treat
worship as we often treat out faith: its validity is measured by
the degree of warm feeling we have. Since when is our faith measured by
feeling? Since when is worship of God evaluated in terms of our own
received benefit?

Many things could be said about the character of worship. Most of
what we could say needs to be worked out in our lives. Worship is work.
It does not come easily or naturally. (This goes for worship in the
broad sense of duty and service as well as for worship in the narrow
sense of a corporate "service of worship." ) Worship which leads to
true community is an offering of our own lives, our devotion and piety
to God. At the same time it is an offering of the church and its faith
(which often stands far above our own individual experience) unto God.

We at Fuller need to do some hard thinking on this matter of com-
monity and worship. We can no longer cavalierly say that it does not
concern us or that it is merely a question of background or taste. In
the matter of worship, we need to seriously consider the implications
of our present chapel situation in which worship, at best, is only a
secondary consideration. In the matter of community we need to face the
reality that community is not an option for the Christian. We need to
recognize that both contemptuous indifference and sentimentalism are
devise at this point.

Sleepers awake!

* * *

SEMINARY: WHY AM I HERE? by Thomas F. Johnson

"... his soul was continually wrenched in crisis over the
scraggled look of his meticulously cultured beard. ..."

The two stories which you are about to read are true, true of each
of us to a certain extent, and to that extent tragic.

Once upon a time there was a young man named Will Doowit, who
enrolled as a student at Fuller Seminary. He registered for the minimum
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number of hours, including evening Greek. (He had a good reason, though. He had spent most of his time doing beach evangelism. The Lord blessed his ministry with a "harvest" of souls. Several Christian surfers also rededicated their lives. He had accomplished much, having labored faithfully) He worked his class schedule out just right so that Monday evenings, and two afternoons a week were free for his field work assignment, besides weekends. This did mean that he was a little pressed for study time, but he never skipped a class, and so felt that he could get by. Besides, long ago he had claimed Ecclesiastes 12:12 as his "life verse."

He passed his four years (four, due to the fact that the next summer Hebrew proved a burden too great for his schedule, and he had had to postpone it until the fall. He had a good reason, though. But I won't go into it.) in a bustle of service, and by graduation was recognized in his church as a dynamic, sharp, energetic, talented go-getter for God. His greatest success had been among college students, where after alienating a few trouble-makers (you know, the kind that are always trying to bug you with trick questions that really don't have any answers, who are more interested in intellectualizing than in being saved and walking with Jesus, and who probably wouldn't understand your answers even if you could understand their questions, troublemakers!), he was able to build up his group around two campus wheels who started coming. That was the key: big ones attract little ones. Upon graduation he was called as Minister of Youth to a large, conservative church in North Hollywood and lived blissfully everafter.

Once upon a time there was a young man named B. R. Ainsville, who enrolled as a student at Fuller Seminary. He took all the required courses plus three electives, all in the theology division, of course. B. R. had a difficult time of it, not that he found anything really hard about the courses (on the contrary, he was appalled by the lack of critical acumen on the part of certain professors, not to mention his disgust at the philosophical-theological naivete displayed by certain fellow students, like Will Doowit), but his soul was continually wracked in crisis over the scraggled look of his meticulously cultured beard, and over whether cigarettes or a pipe best expressed his real self. We must not get the wrong impression! It was not image he was concerned about. Freid forbid! It was, rather, "being that self which one truly is," as he said.

He worked out his schedule just right so that he was busy every afternoon and evening, including weekends, except Sunday evenings. That time he lift open for "the powers of his soul to mingle and interpenetrate with the Over-soul," although sometimes he called it "communing with the ground of his being." What church did he attend? Well, one cannot really say definitely. Since his background was a church which had split from the Conservative Baptists (who had split from the Northern Baptists, and so on), the first church that he attended was Episcopalian, then a Lutheran one, then a Presbyterian, then a Methodist, etc. Finally, due to the fact that he began to stay up late on Saturday nights, catching up on his Teilhard de Chardin," he started sleeping in on Sunday mornings. Needless to say, his field work reports left something to be desired. But then, field work was something for people who weren't really concerned with the important issues of life. He was, and this is consistent
with the fact that his "life verse" was Isaiah 40:13-14, which he applied to himself as a vigorous challenge.

He passed his three years with no academic sweat, having refuted publicly every visiting lecturer, and having taken a series of solid D's in the ministry division courses. Upon graduation he was refused ordination by three different denominations, took a Ph.D. in philosophy at Columbia, nearly split several churches by agitating trouble over controversial issues and by pitting people against pastor, and died one night suddenly in his sleep.

THE SEMINARY: ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING
by Richard W. Burr

"...solidification of a few seminaries into one main complex of general facilities, preferably around a university setting, could be the soon familiar 'new face'."

Within the next ten years, "new faces" will attend Fuller Theological Seminary, but a "new face" could also emerge upon the seminary institution. No doubt, the students and faculty alike are well aware of the rapid, electric-like pace that looms over educational institutions. Seminaries at large, are no exception. The rising costs of maintaining and facilitating educational resources are staggering. Fuller Seminary has not been delinquent in foreseeing these problems as poignant concerns. The next ten years are being considered, and this means gradual change now along with consistent changes through the future.

Predictions concerning seminaries indicate that small denominational seminaries will gradually fade away from the academic setting and solidification of a few seminaries into one main complex of general facilities, preferably around a university setting, could be the soon familiar "new face." Plans to meet these ideas are being discussed at the present time amongst trustees, alumni, and faculty.

Just what are the perspectives Fuller Seminary is contemplating? What are the concerns and opportunities to students in relation to these incumbent changes?

Satellite Schools: Fuller has been unique in establishing satellite schools in the divinity school milieu. Dr. Hubbard has expressed opinion that no further schools will be added in the near future but that every effort will be made to inculcate the two schools into the mainstream of seminary life.

Dean of Students: Appointments are being considered for the dean of students and the Director of Public Relations. Dr. Daniel Fuller commented that the position for a dean of students has been of utmost priority and that "a concrete possibility" is being considered. There are several concrete possibilities for the position of Public Relations Director.

Scholarships: Students will be interested in knowing that scholarships, loans, and grants have been made available to the Seminary at a time when opportunities for aid have never been so plentiful. Dr. Bush is
preparing a letter in the Spring for all students who are interested in applying for aid. At that time students will be able to indicate their need on the basis of a yearly appraisal and may request forms for making application in the Spring quarter.

Federal Loans: Although final confirmation has not been received from Washington, D.C. Fuller has applied and been granted some $40,000 in National Defense and Student Loans for the School of Theology and the School of Psychology. Students at Fuller are also eligible for the College Student Guaranteed Loan Program. The maximum amounts a student may borrow will range from $1,000 to $1,5000 per year. Students with an adjusted family income of less than $15,000 a year pay no interest while in an eligible school. The Federal Government pays the lender the interest (6 percent maximum) during this time. The student begins repayment to the lender when he graduates or withdraws from school. During the repayment period the Federal Government will pay part of the interest (3 percent) on the unpaid balance. Students are eligible for this loan at the present time. Actually, these loans offer a longer period for repayment (ten years) at a lower cost of interest than do the present loans available through the school.

Student Help: Last year Fuller Seminary was able to help finance approximately 120 students. With the added Federal Loans it will be possible to facilitate an even greater number.

There are, therefore, several changes taking place in the life of the seminary which have indubitably made Fuller Seminary aware of her role in the complexities of this present life.

* * *

PRACTICS

by David K. Garth

"The difficulty with students everywhere comes in the application of what they have learned to what they say in their sermons."

Goals conflict, abilities differ, interests diverge: no two students coincide throughout their seminary sojourns. But, all students come to Fuller expecting their studies to bear fruit. The Christian experience enters the believer's life with some outward manifestation and then, working from the inside out, produces some expression of belief. Except for the power of the Holy Spirit, our Christianity might very well be defined as nothing more than a peculiar expression of humanity. And even when we recognize the Holy Spirit as a kind of invisible core for our expressions, the Christian faith which we see, feel, and live with is largely a matter of these expressions of our faith. Formally, the ministry department with its curriculum ranging from funerals to foreign missions and from sermonizing to sensitizing develops a student's ability to lead others to express their faith. Besides this academic preparation, the seminary encourages students to participate in field work and in the Church in Mission Committee.

Dr. James Daane, who has brought a sharp and sometimes prickly theological awareness to the homiletics courses, kindly gave the opinion a few of his first impressions of the ministry department. The speech facilities, including Mr. White's communication course, the speech lab, and the new audio-visual console equip Fuller as well as any seminary Dr. Daane knows. Noting the essential place of worship in the life of believing he expressed his considerable surprise at not finding any course in liturgics among the core courses (ironically, the "bookish" theology department has made efforts in this direction, cf. Dr. Bromiley's seminar on Christian Worship, Dr. Jewett's on hymnology and the latter's syllabus on systematic theology -ed.). When questioned on the relationship between the ministry department and the departments of theology and Bible,
PRACTICS (Continued from page 6)

Dr. Daane characterized the ministry as the result or end product which comes out of the context of systematic and biblical theology. Particularly in the ministry of the Word, this background can be described as that which "gives the dimension of eternity in preaching." The difficulty with students everywhere comes in the application of what they have learned to what they say in their sermons. He offered two general reasons for this difficulty. First, students need to sense the differences in the disciplines of systematic and biblical theology and in the tradition of the church; and, specifically, they need to see how these distinct disciplines relate to preaching. Second, there is an American tendency toward activism that skips over the basis and background for that activity.

Turning now to the activities of the Church In Mission Committee, we find here the most flexible outlet for student expression. Under the leadership of a coordinator the committee intends "to keep the mission of the church before the student body" and to coordinate the student organizations which implement this purpose. These organizations, the Church In Mission at Home, the Church In Mission Overseas, the Social Concern, and the Middler Year in Mission Committees specialize in providing information that tends toward involvement. Although these organizations are entirely initiated and supported by students, this writer finds it curious that until this year the seminary's only consistent attempt at supervised field work has been under the auspices of the CIM committee. A man may intern with a foreign mission board after his second year and receive not only financial aid, but also academic preparation, evaluation, and credit through the School of World Missions. Not to be overlooked in this regard are the opportunities within all four committees for the exchange of ideas and criticism among students who are engaged in some ministry parttime.

Most students find field work as much a necessity for the maintenance of the flesh as of the spirit. Apart from joining the lament over this fact, let me mention two sources for hope in this area. The trial intern program at La Canada Presbyterian Church in which several students have met weekly for seminars with the pastor has proven valuable to all parties. In the final analysis however, one can ask whether the quality of the program will spring from the students' desire for accreditation or the school's desire for better prepared graduates. Finally, the pastoral doctoral program under Dr. Daane is scheduled for christening next year. From this side of the B.D., my only comment is the hearty wish that from here as from the other satellite schools and programs that surround the divinity school, the old queen might receive some service to herself in addition to easy veneration.

///

*   *   *

SCHOLARSHIP AND THE GAP IN EDUCATION

by Steve Lim

"... I am frustrated by the fact that I do not have the opportunity to interact with the professors."

The very mention of academic considerations generally brings a flurry of complaints from students: Certain classes require a disproportionate amount of work. Other courses do not cover a topic to the students' satisfaction. Some professors do not relate to students as well as others. Assignments occasionally seem devoid of value. Spiritual vitality often seems lacking. Et cetera.

I shall grant that most of these criticisms are true; for, in the past (hopefully), they have been sources of varying irritation for me also. Yet, as I contemplate the nature of a seminary and realize its limitations, I perceive that much of CONTINUED ON PAGE 8
my discontent has resulted from expecting too much. Basically, a seminary should be
expected to offer a high level of dedicated scholarship, which trains the student in
the understanding of the Christian revelation and in the ministry to people. Well
developed courses and spiritually inspiring professors would be highly desired, but
these cannot be demanded in all cases. Rather, we can appreciate the frequency with
which they are present.

If seen in terms of this limited purpose, the academic qualifications of Fuller
Seminary certainly fulfill most expectations. Few students would doubt the academic
integrity and excellence of the faculty. Indeed I value the opportunity to study
here primarily because I can study in an atmosphere of intellectual openness and
dedicated excellence in scholarship.

However, because of this appreciation, I am frustrated by the fact that I do
not have the opportunity to interact with the professors. I feel that this stimula­
tion should be possible in a smaller institution of Fuller's nature. But, surpris­
ingly, the majority of courses are conducted in almost identical fashion to the lower
division courses offered at large universities; i.e., the rule is large lecture classes
with no opportunity for significant discussion. In fact, many of these university cou
courses have been sensibly scheduled to include weekly section meetings for small
group interaction. As large a campus as the University of California at Berkeley
(27,500 enrolled) actually maintains professor-led tutorials (ranging in size from
three to ten students) for 750 freshmen students.

Lectures vary in usefulness, depending upon the skill of the lecturer in pre­
senting his material. But, in general, a far more efficient method for learning
would be the distribution of the lecture material in written form. These could be
read, reread, underlined, digested, and interacted with several times in a one hour
period. Then profitable discussion with the professor might take place. Simply to
maintain the standard lecture system is to waste the talents of highly qualified men.

Some professors honestly endeavor to incorporate discussion into their lectures.
Oftentimes, however, this further decreases the educational usefulness of the time
spent. Meaningful discussion simply does not take place in classes of 40 to 80 stu­
dents. First, only questions of a clarifying nature can really be entertained.
Secondly, usually all but a few students are "tuned out" as to the nature of the
question under discussion. That is the reason why I hesitate to raise questions.
Adequate discussion on the point raised would mean to monopolize class time on a
question few other students would be thinking of at the moment.

Very briefly, then, I would desire the reduction of the number of orally
presented lectures, which would be replaced by their commitment to writing (via ditto
or mimeo). In the time made available, I would like to interact with the professor
in small group discussions on this material periodically.

The precise details of any improvements may be uncertain. But, in my opinion,
the need for improved efficiency in the educative process is unquestionable. The
knowledge explosion has resulted in the proliferation of information which needs to
be mastered. If we are to adequately prepare for the profound calling of the ministry
in this age of challenging change, we must use our time wisely. On the more mundane
level, the high cost of education (The average cost per class hour per student is
$4.50, of which the student pays $1.50) is also an imperative for the efficient use
of God's time and money. The Fuller Seminary catalogue of 1966-68 (p.15) reminds
students that academic mediocrity is an insult to God. Educational mediocrity is no
less a sin.

/////
ODE

O shining figure
Who skates along the rim
Where dream becomes reality:
Now you are real...
Now you are only a memory, a wish.
My heart knows thee,
But my mind denies thee,
Or if my mind thee accepts,
My heart forgets.
Where is love?
Cannot my heart with its divine imaginings
Convince my mind of thee?
O stubborn mind
Who accepts only that which is.

SIMPLE GIFT

I gave my Love some flowers today,
of sensuous red were they.
Of sensuous red and flaming green,
er her heart did steal away.

Was it the beauty of the flower
that pierced then her heart?
Or was it I for whom she sighed,
who stole the flower's part?
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