Once upon a time there was a little white rat. He lived in a cage with his mother and brothers and sisters. He was not very old, as you might expect, since he still lived with the nuclear family. His life was busy and full. He ate and slept, played and fought and was just generally being imprinted with his own rat identity.

And then one day tragedy struck. Unbeknownst to our little rat friend, a psychologist had an idea. And to prove (or maybe even disprove, though that is always unlikely) this particular idea, the psychologist needed a small healthy rat to pull a lever.

You might ask, "Why doesn't the psychologist pull the lever himself?" But perhaps you don't realize that the psychologist has a PhD and therefore he must have others pull levers for him. I know it seems strange that after all his work and study the PhD should have such a small young rat for an assistant. But you must remember that because the rat is young and small he will be easily impressed (or taught), and that is the best kind of assistant.

Perhaps you think it sad that this little rat can no longer go on to discover his true unique ratishness, but this is because you are not a tough-minded scientist. Emotions could only deter the scientist with an idea that must be proved. Chances are that our rat friend will prove the psychologist's "big" idea. In some quite unscientific way he will "pick up" what the scientist wants to prove—pull the lever, run the maze, or shock himself dippy.

Perhaps you want to say, "Yes, hurrah for scientific proof, but think about the "self" that this rat might have discovered if the psychologist had left him alone!" Your mistake here is that your feelings, your unscientific feelings, are rat-oriented. If you were tough-minded and scientific, you would know that scientific truth is more important than one little old rat.

Sometimes I feel like a motherless rat as a student in the psychology program. I often feel like I'm here to prove someone else's big idea.

To bring off a solid integration of the Christian faith and psychology is a monumental and urgent task. I believe this must be
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AN EDITORIAL ON STUDENT ELECTIONS

It is of little wonder that elections for student body offices at Fuller Seminary arouse no great interest among us or are little more than contests of popularity. There can hardly be any deep concern or any serious evaluation of candidates when those whom we choose will have little opportunity or authority to make meaningful decisions. Lest I be misunderstood, I do not mean that student leaders do not have control over various projects, retreats, programs, parties, etc.—They do. What I mean is that when it comes right down to the areas where our greatest interest is at stake, to the matters that most vitally affect us, the men whom we elect this month will have virtually nothing to say, and by "have no say" I mean "have no significant and determinative influence". (There may be lots of talk.) These most vital areas are curriculum, faculty, and administration. Decisions made in these areas are at the heart of what we have come to Fuller for, a theological education. They are at the core of our calling—and our leaders, in these very matters, can speak no creative and formative word.

What then of the approaching elections? What should our attitude be? Some may counsel that we abstain, seeing no really important end served by voting. Others may advocate contentment with "what must be" and that we vote for the best men to accomplish limited tasks. And certainly there may be others who will "rah-rah" for their "buddy", dormmate, or classmate, treating the elections as they often have been, as contests of popularity (if not beauty!).

But I believe that we should follow none of these counsels, thinking more wisely than the first, being dissatisfied with the second, and scorning the third. Rather, despite the apparent hopelessness of our situation, despite the pessimism that we feel, we should demand of our candidates an authentic willingness to "fight city hall" when and where it must be fought. Further, we should pledge ourselves not to elect anyone who is merely efficient in the status quo, who will not, even for the sake of his fellow students, oppose the Establishment, if and when such opposition is necessary. Such candidates and such a determination we must require, not for selfish ends, but because the Christian ministry demands the kind of theological education that can only come about by full and meaningful student involvement.
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accomplished first, before work can be done on such a secondary issue as integrating reformed orthodox theology with psycho-therapy.

Fuller is theologically unique and by this very uniqueness has a doctrinal stance quite different from other fine Christians and fine Christian institutions. I feel the School of Psychology must at the outset be free to consider the total spectrum of the Christian faith. Every Christian position from that of Pope John XXIII to Miss Velma should be examined. Maybe the orthodox position on the authority of Scripture, for instance, will form part of the integration. Maybe total depravity will be the view of man that will best serve a Christian psychology—but maybe not. It is too soon to tell.

To say that the above doctrines, or any others, have to be agreed upon now is premature in my mind. At this point, specific doctrines that are insisted upon by either psychology or theology make this rat feel like someone already has his mind made up.

As the younger of the two institutions gropes for both its professional and spiritual identity, those who represent the Seminary may be hard pressed at times to explain the School of Psychology to the Fuller constituency.

The identity of the Seminary is more or less fixed. Those of the Christian public who give to its support, do so because of the Seminary's uniqueness. To insist that the infant School of Psychology must mirror the Seminary's doctrinal stance, is a smothering, mothering relationship, detrimental to the growth of both institutions. Surely a different constituency could be developed that would support the School of Psychology for what it is, not because of its relationship to the Seminary. It would be a tragedy if our theological colleagues have to continue to explain, justify, and perhaps even apologize for the School of Psychology.

If the School of Psychology was intended to bring together those faculty and students who agreed, for example, on the authority of Scripture, a most unusual image was projected to the Christian public. How well I remember Drs. Frankl, Tournier and Mowrer—spiritual men to be sure; but put them all together and they do not spell orthodoxy. It seems impossible that the same institution that invited Victor Frankl would in two short years consider closing the School of Psychology to all save those with a B.D. from Fuller Seminary or those willing to take the Fuller core theological courses.

Fuller Seminary is a theological school. But it is a unique school. It's theology is reformed orthodoxy. In much the same way the School of Psychology is unique. It is too soon to fix upon it such a definite label as the School of Theology enjoys. Too soon in the short history of this school and too soon for psychology itself—yet an upstart among academic disciplines. Psychology in America is less than 100 years; and psycho-therapy, by clinical psychologists scarcely existed before World War II.
WHOSE BIG IDEA WAS THIS? (continued)

Yet a certain character is emerging in the school, at least from this student's point of view. The data base courses are almost all taught by practicing clinicians. Although a research degree is the final goal, the heavy emphasis is on the profession of psycho-therapist. Some psychology students wish to teach, but the majority are here to learn both the skills and the art of practicing therapy. Our uniqueness is psycho-therapy. Our school running at capacity will eventually produce each year twice as many clinical (or counseling) psychologists as UCLA and USC combined.

Admittedly part of our problem is that the academic PhD degree is being given to those seeking a profession that at this time does not have a professional degree. Many believe that within a decade the Doctor of Psychology professional degree will exist. It is surely needed, and Fuller's experimental pilot project is out at the "cutting edge" of this field.

Unless our main task is to prove tough-minded scientists' or theologians' theories, let the School of Psychology find its own identity. Let it be first a school of psychology, not causing need of excuse or apology.

Let us be separate and unique—even as the Seminary is unique. Let us be taught theology, at our invitation. Let us stand willing to teach, upon invitation.

Robert Frost said that good fences make good neighbors. It is more important that the rats get their identity straight now, in their youth. There will be plenty of time to pull levers later.

* * * * *

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FULLER SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

by Dr. Bower

From the very first effort to bring a school of psychology into existence at Fuller Seminary, the writer has been actively interested in the contribution that such a school could make to the cause of Christ and his Church.

Why was this type of institution located next to a theological seminary? And why was a theological seminary interested in a school espousing a discipline which has not always been on positive terms with the theological world?

A history of the School of Psychology will show that there was a considerable number of theological educators, ministers, and laymen who were convinced that the Church had abandoned an important part of the healing ministry which it had once performed. They felt the Church needed to recover the counseling and psychotherapeutic dimension of this ministry since evidence was rapidly accumulating that its
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SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FULLER SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY (continued)

skills had much to offer Christians who were experiencing emotional difficulty—difficulty sometimes due to their ignorance of the laws of mental health, sometimes to a lack of knowledge concerning the combinations of personality traits which produce tension in the home, and a further lack of knowledge of the methods for modifying personality patterns once these are identified as being deficient and in need of constructive change.

Since our Lord, Himself, went about teaching, preaching, and healing (Matt.4:23), it was felt that the important ministry of healing the emotionally and mentally disturbed should once again be an integral part of the Church's ministry. Furthermore, there has been the strong conviction in some quarters of the psychological world that guilt, real guilt, is a basic causal factor in many emotional disturbances. I, personally, cannot accept the thesis that all emotional disturbance has at its roots the element of real guilt, though I do strongly believe on the basis of my clinical experience and the statements of the majority of leaders in the fields of psychology and psychiatry, that this is one of the important causes (along with others, such as extreme pressures upon a person in his childhood years to attain unrealistic academic, physical, social, or spiritual goals). If real guilt is one of several basic factors in the etiology of many types of mental illness, then it logically follows that no complete restoration of mental health is possible in such cases until the guilt is removed. We believe that there will always be an ontological anxiety present preventing an individual from achieving a total recovery if the element of unresolved guilt remains. It is at this point that the Christian psychologist can bring to the therapeutic session the only answer to the problem of real guilt: forgiveness through Christ as Savior.

Also, if self-actualization or the development of one's God-given gifts is an objective of the therapeutic process, as it certainly is for many therapists, then it may be confidently said that maximal self-actualization involves the cultivation of one's abilities for the purpose of fulfilling the plan God has for his life. True identity and authenticity can only come to the individual as he is confronted by, and accepts, the Word of God. It is the Christian therapist, we believe, who can best help a person toward this end, assuming that he, the therapist, possesses intelligence, training, motivation, and experience equivalent to that of the secular therapist.

The presence of real guilt in many emotional disturbances and the desirable goal of maximum self-actualization and true authenticity, therefore, lead us to the conclusion that there is a place in the psychological world (which is increasingly stressing values in the therapeutic process) for a school of psychology with a Christian orientation and value system.

The unique contribution which our School of Psychology can make has been stated in many ways. An examination of the reports and minutes of the various committees concerned with the founding of the school would probably state the unique goal of the school in this way:
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The unique goal which justifies the founding of a School of Psychology and affiliating it with a theological institution is that of developing an integrated theological-psychological conceptual framework, involving Fuller Seminary's theology as expressed in its statement of faith, within which psychotherapy may be conducted from a phenomenological perspective, thus assisting the therapist in understanding the problem of a church member from his own frame of reference and not from one that is foreign to, or misinterprets, the nature of the problem which he presents.

That misunderstandings and misinterpretations have occurred when church members have provided non-Christian psychotherapists with data from their religious experience there is little doubt. This is not to say that some kinds of religious thinking do not contribute to emotional disturbances. On the contrary, there is a great deal of poor theology and careless interpretation of scripture which, in this writer's opinion, has contributed to an aggravations and exacerbation of certain types of psychopathological conditions. But it is also true that some psychoanalytic schools have labeled religion and its concomitant experiences as prime factors in the production of overly sensitive superegos and the resultant neurotic and psychotic ideations characteristic of the mentally disturbed. We believe that evidence is now available, however, to demonstrate that Christianity with its value system and high moral code combats rather than fosters mental illness.

The conceptual framework which is to be developed, however, must grow out of years of empirical research and dialogue conducted by students and faculties of both schools. It should not be imposed by some armchair philosopher or psychologist. It was the carefully considered recommendations of our consultants that this framework be constructed from the integration seminars and the doctoral research studies carried out by the doctoral candidates. Perhaps after 20 or 30 years (or more) of such research and dialogue would the dim outline of an integrated theo-psychological therapeutic system begin to appear. If sufficient cooperation is achieved on the part of all concerned, it may well be that a very significant and almost startling contribution to the fields of both theology and psychology could be made by that time. This writer along with the other therapists at the Counseling Center have seen Christians make remarkable changes and methodically and systematically improve their relationships with their spouses, their parents, and their children through the use of the techniques employed in the field of psychotherapy so that there is greater love and peace and kindness and understanding in the home, this is evidence to us that psychology can be used of God to assist theological education and, perhaps, theology itself in the formulation of truth.

Now there are some students who feel that the schools of theology and psychology should develop independently of each other. As I see this proposition, it would defeat the very purpose and uniqueness of the institution as conceived by the Board, the Administration, and the Faculty (as well as our outside professional consultants). It will only be through the cooperation of the two schools that the unique goal of the School of Psychology will be achieved and the School's continued presence and existence justified.

There are other students who have inquired about the nature of the theology to be integrated with the propositions of psychology. The answer as I see it (and I do not speak in any official capacity) must be in terms of the evangelical tradition of our Seminary. This, as I remember it, was made very explicit at the inception of the school. It is to be an evangelical theology
as expressed in the statement of faith of Fuller. It is expected that a student who enrolls at our institution will be sympathetic with our position, though we do not insist that he agree with us. We feel he should follow one of the unwritten laws in higher education when he attends an institution noted for a certain point of view: attempt to understand the school’s viewpoint and politely and courteously question it if one wishes, but avoid being (and I use these words purposely) destructive and thoughtlessly critical.

For example, if you were to study with one of the outstanding European theologians, the assumption would be that you would be sympathetic with his position when attending his classes or seminars. Or, that at the minimum, you would be there to understand (though not necessarily accept) his views. Politeness, courtesy, and dignity combined with careful and thoughtful interaction would be expected. Otherwise, a graduate student would do well to join the particular group of scholars with which he agrees and let the battle of ideologies occur between the universities holding particular philosophies or theologies, but avoid trying to win major battles at the level of the class or seminar.

Finally, I hope I understand the concern of the theological faculty, of which I am a member, for the communication of the truth of God’s revelation. There is a very real danger which psychology poses for theology in any kind of integrative activity between the two disciplines. Richardson has expressed it clearly in his Christian Apologetics (p. 37) when he says:

Theology will deny the validity of its own special categories and abdicate its rank as an independent science, if it surrenders to the view that Christian truth is evolved out of man’s own religious consciousness, and thus renounces the historic conception of a given revelation. Theology as a science stands or falls with the category of revelation; if there is no distinctively Christian revelation in history, the special categories of theology will not be needed, and in the place of theology the scientific study of religion could be more competently undertaken by the psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists. The century of theological activity which Schleiermacher opened, it is worthy of remark, explored every conceivable method of interpreting the phenomena of Christian existence by means of non-theological categories; but it closed with the confident re-assertion of those categories and the renewed insistence upon the independence of theology.

This states quite well one of the central problems presently existing between the two fields. On the other hand, there has always been a culturally determined psychology connected with the observations, interpretations, and perceptions of each generation of theologians. The question is whether we wish to be satisfied with a 19th century psychology related to a 20th century theology or would rather seek a 20th century and vastly improved psychology related to assist theology in its work today.

Psychology and the other behavioral sciences, for example, have fostered a re-examination of the whole area of the theology of sex and marriage. Theologians assisted by psychologist, psychiatrist, sociologist, and others are now suggesting interpretations of Scripture which are radically different from those held by the Church for hundreds and hundreds of years.

If the assumption is made, however, that all presently used theological categories (not Biblical categories) and thinking must be maintained, then little productive dialogue can take place. But if there is openness and humility in regard to the formulation of truth, then exciting things can be the result. I would maintain that, given a commitment to the data of Biblical
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**PIUS DISHonesty AND CIVIL RIGHTS**  
by William Walker

Now that most of us have been at least vicariously immersed in the concerns of social justice and Christian responsibility, it is time for a clarification and delineation of the motives which we, the Christian community, are professing to have. The raison d'etre for my "Christian" concern was punctured deeply by a statement made by a negro in the film, "A Time for Burning": "You, Whitey, are runnin' scared. No wonder you're on the 'make'; The whole power structure of your society is about to defecate around your heads." This rather "liberalize rendition of his intention fingers a very significant sore which has been unconsciously bandaged off into the nether reaches of our Christian consciences. Precisely, why is it that we are so concerned about our Negro brothers in the Ghetto? Is it really because of love or is it because we are faced with a great Societal problem and we're "runnin'scared" or piously desire to see a gross inequity rectified? More pointedly, this leads us to the question of whether love is possible when the real reason for this Christianly respectable euphemism is couched in terms of "fear" of what might happen...if...We don't "do something quick!" Are we really loving when we are using love as the pretext for excising this festering thorn from our flesh, or, on a more sophisticated plane, of solving our hoary consciences of three hundred years of despicable immorality? This of course embroils us in a semantic jungle of definition in which we can safely lose ourselves if we would rather not come to terms with the possible dishonesty under which most of us operate.

What then is "love" and how is it expressed. The most perfect expression of love has been graphically illustrated in the selfless "Agape" of God the Father. But that which gives "Agape" its distinctive meaning is found in the nature of its recipients. Mankind in no sense deserved this "Agape"; it deserved death which is the very antithesis of what it received. The only way we can explain the "why" of this love is that it issued from no prior reasons on God's part other than God loves because God loves. This type of selfless loving has become the ideal for our existentially oriented sub-cultures. We live to love, but not to "use" in the guise of love; for when we "use" someone to our own ends or as the means to our satisfaction, we can hardly parrot that we love selflessly. Even more important, we cannot honestly say that we are trying to love selflessly unless we are so out of touch with the meaning of relationship that we have completely "vacuated" "Agape" of all its content.

Yet, we are still faced with the question, "Is man capable of loving in the manner of "Agape" and if not, how and why does he express love?" In order for man to express "Agape" his very nature must be one of love so that he may love with nothing expected in return - with no prior reason for loving other than love itself. As the case happens to be, man can only love in relationship - when there is a "Thou" confronting him who is responding in love to his love. The love we experience is never a one way street, but occurs in the mutual loving of two persons; although, after we have been "in love" we are able to abstract the content of this experience from its original source and apply it to a hypothetical, though real, relationship with God. Nonetheless, in that we can know
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of love only in relationship, we are bound to the "Thou" of this relationship. In other words, we can only love as we are given love in return, so that in its purest form I love because he/she loves me. And the more equal this mutual giving becomes, the more meaning this love will have for both persons. Thus we say, "I love you for what you are, for what your love is to me."

Since I have answered only partially how and why we love, we must probe deeper into what makes this love possible in the first place. Our clue is found in the "Thou" confronting us. He is worthy of being loved; he is able to bring into our relationship as much as I can and so has an intrinsic value for me. In these terms I consider it a meaningless abstraction to say, "I will love the person in spite of what he 'is' or what he is worth to me," for the person "is" what he "is" and this to us ranges from the lovely to the unlovely. Thus, we cannot say that we love a person or even a group of people unless they have a value for me. Understood in this sense, we can say that we love a person because of the intrinsic value of his soul, yet this abstraction of the person before us robs love of the content which is found in relationship; for when we divorce the value of the soul from the value of the person himself, no longer do we love a person but some abstraction which happens to coincide with a person. The love "of" Christ does constrain us to love, but when our "love" is expressed only in hypothetical terms rather than in concrete realities, we can hardly claim to "loving others" as being our prime motivation. We are able to say that our motivation for doing what we do is based on the love of Christ. Yet, so long as this remains in the hypothetical realm of "oughtness", which in itself is a subtle form of coercion, our high motivation has lost its content since the meaning of love has been stripped away, and left us with only the husk of direction. Therefore, we "love" because we ought to love, and what we think is loving is nothing more than gaudy wrappings which belie the shallowness of the gift presented. However, all is not lost. When our love for others stems from the love we have experienced in relationship with Christ, and from the richness of this love which has increased for us the meaning of love, we are capable of bringing into a relationship a real content to the word "love."

We are also able to bridge the "equality" and "value" gaps in a greater way than ever before so that we can truthfully love even though he is not what we formerly could have loved. Yet, there will always remain that swath of persons whom even the most mature cannot relate in love to, even though they possess the strongest and purest of motivations within them. They are not God and are yet bound by the limits of loving in relationship.

Assuming that our motivation for loving arises from the love we have experienced, what is the relationship which we have with those who are totally unlovely - those whom we do not in reality love? The answer to this is found in the terms, "concern" and "caring". These may arise from love but they are not the exclusive property of love. Therefore, they also can arise from fear as I have suggested or from an empathy with the situation in which one finds himself. Understandably, the dynamics of relationship enables us to more accurately communicate to the "Thou" confronting us the "why" and "how" of our motivation in confronting them.

But why is it so important for the Christian to understand the distinction between loving and concern? I suggest that it is because there is a wide breach between these two occurrences by virtue of the quality of meaning inherent in our concept of love. If love connoted very little to us, the importance of making the proper distinction would be minimal just as the case often is since loving is equated with having concern and caring; but since the reality of love includes far more, it is disastrous for us to couch our message or our
10.

intentions under these false colors when this, in effect, is not the case. It is disastrous because we are discovered in the shallowness of our real motivations, or even worse, we have deceived ourselves for so long as to what love really is that "we knew not love when most desperately it was needed." In either case the same response arises from the incredulous onlooker before whom we are professing such purity, "Is he for real? He must be kidding." This is to say that we have just struck out as far as any genuine communication is possible, including everything valuable we have or had to offer. It indeed must appear as billows of noxious gasses wafting their way heavenward when our real intentions are so transparent to the beholder. We are hardly fooling anyone but ourselves when we really wish to use this person to satisfy our own ends or to ease our very guilty consciences. Little wonder that the Negro whom I first quoted later remarked that the only reason why this minister was down there speaking to him was because he was being paid to do so, and that he would fade "quick" when his job was on the line. Of course, there will always be those who respond in like-manner to us as long as they can get something for their tolerance of our patented shibboleths. I suppose it could be said that a "phoney" relationship is better than none at all, but it certainly is not too flattering for us to know that we are creating less than the genuine article—that we are pawning off pewter as fine china.

The credibility-gap is not only the problem of politicians but also of Christians and Christianity; and considering its history neither need any help in convincing the world they are fraudulently bilking the naive masses of their last ounces of self-respect. "Social Concern" is certainly no misnomer in labeling our civil-rights activities, but let us not drag our red cape of love through the mud of deceit, if we intend to wave it as our pall of "earnest" piety and "relevant" Christianity. Honesty is much more refreshing and respectable than love when this love is nothing more than an empty hack-term we are strategically using to gain a hearing for our message or for making our Christianity a "meaningful" reality to an age which has discovered, sooner than we, the triteness and insincerity of its well-intentioned bearers.

---

CALVINISM AND FATALISM by Thomas B. Talbott

It is sometimes alleged that Calvinism does not entail fatalism because God not only decrees ends but also the means he has purposed to produce those ends. I should like to put an end to such madness by pointing out an important sense of the word "fatalism" as it appears in ordinary language, a sense which is in fact entailed by the view that God decrees both ends and means.

(1) In respect to human conduct, we sometimes use "fatalism" to signify the view that certain specified ends are fixed, though the means producing those ends are to some extent left open. Thus, if John has decided to travel to New York City, and if it is fated that he shall die in a train accident on the day that he leaves, he may nevertheless be free to choose one of several modes of transportation; but if perchance he chooses to fly, the mysterious power of fate will so intervene, perhaps by causing engine trouble on his plane or otherwise controlling circumstances, that by force of circumstances John will end up on the train anyway, and die in a train accident. Now clearly Calvinism does not entail this kind of fatalism, because this kind of fatalism is consistent with a degree of human freedom (in the sense of the power of contrary choice).
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CALVINISM AND FATALISM (continued from page 10)

In saying that God decrees ends, the Calvanist does not say that those ends will come about regardless of the choices a man makes.

(2) There is, however, a more common and more important sense of the word "fatalism" in common usage. According to this sense, "fatalism" means that everything has been fixed beforehand in the sense that not only certain historical events but all historical events and the means producing those events are unavoidable. Thus, not only is John's train accident unavoidable. It is unavoidable that he will take a plane that develops engine trouble, transfer to a train, and be killed in a train accident. In the first sense of "fatalism," John could choose to drive to New York City, but would somehow end up in a train accident anyway. In the second sense of "fatalism," John could avoid the accident if he should choose some other course of action, such as driving to New York City, but there is no possibility that he will choose any course of action other than that of taking a plane which develops engine trouble, etc. It is this sense of the word "fatalism" that is entailed by the view that God decrees means as well as ends.

In conclusion: Position A obviously does not entail consequence x if "x" is defined in such a way that it is excluded from A. If "fatalism" is used in the first sense, in a sense compatible with free will, then I concede that Calvinism does not entail fatalism; but we ordinarily use "fatalism" in the second sense, in a sense which excludes free will, and in this sense of the word "fatalism," fatalism is entailed by Calvinism.

AFTER-SEMINARY TRAINING
by Gary Collins

There are several alternatives for this training. One is to go on to further graduate work after seminary. Another is to intern under a competent minister. Another might be to enter some kind of youth work (Young Life, Inter-Varsity, Campus Crusade) before entering the ministry. However, there is another possibility seldom thought of: working for a corporation for two years.

We at seminary often hear that as ministers we aren't communicating to our congregations. Then we go to church on Sunday and fail to find anything that meets us where we live. We wonder how long this situation can continue. How long will people be polite enough to sit and listen Sunday after Sunday to something that really doesn't reach them? We need to train ourselves to speak to our congregations.

To work for a corporation is an unusual but not a foolish suggestion; and this is why. Fifteen years after we as seminary men graduate, we will, if we have received a good education, be ministering to large and probably upper-middle class congregations, unless we are missionaries. We may not like the thought of this now, but this is most certainly what will happen. The congregations will be composed largely of company and professional men, not construction workers. We're going to have to talk to them in their world.

The life of the Seminarian, like that of any student, is idyllic— varied schedule, skip when you want, and a great deal of stimulation. The minister's life is certainly harder, but the outsider would still consider it unrealistic. "How can the minister get up and talk about my giving more time to the Lord when I have to work overtime at the job? He knows nothing about that." For these reasons, I am suggesting the importance of working for a company.
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AFTER-SEMINARY TRAINING (continued from page 11)

There would be several advantages in this. First, especially if you work for an excellent corporation, you would begin to feel what the overall security they provide is like. You would realize how much harder it is for these people to find their security in the Lord. A good salary and fringe benefits, such as employee stock options and company insurance, would begin to help you realize how nice it all really is. Hopefully, you would begin to take an interest in accumulating securities and gaining a knowledge of the stock market—something in which ministers, compared to their congregations, are practically illiterate. When, for instance, was the last time you heard a sermon on, "The Christian Planning of a Securities Portfolio"? Yet, this would immediately touch many men in the congregation right where they live. Here is a perfect opportunity to preach discipleship in something that may totally involve them, but how many ministers can or would do this?

In short, by working for a corporation you would develop an insight into the materialism that is weakening and destroying the spiritual vigor of our evangelical churches. You would see how tempting the possession of things is for your congregation. You would learn more effectively how to talk to the people facing it. You could more intelligently pray and preach about it in your coming years of ministry.

Secondly, you could acquire a host of sermon material—employee-manager relations, office parties, commuter problems, company management problems, on-the-job witnessing situations, production slump, time wasting, production-schedule rush, salary complaints, promotions, sales meetings, etc. You could find hundreds of things if you kept your eyes open (and if these things sound strange to you, you have the out-of-touch problem right now). This is the world our people will live in, and we must learn to make God real in these situations.

Third, you would experience the same year-round (not just Summer) 8:00 to 5:00 schedule, day-in and day-out, that your congregation does. Much of it is without any stimulation, and you would feel the "dog-tiredness" that comes from boredom or from the fast pace of fighting through the working day. It is hard for men to go to church board meetings and extra activities at night when they're tired.

Finally, you will get a good look at the man you are trying to reach for the Lord. Though you may have gone to school with him as an undergraduate, he isn't the same man now. You need to look at him again; his interests have changed. He'd rather go camping on the weekend than come and hear you. He's more interested in finishing his patio than in whether or not the Bible is true. You have to find the level on which you can reach this man, if you want to reach him.

How many of you have worked during the summers. "Isn't this enough?" you say. Certainly this helps to get a view of the other world, but most of your jobs have probably been unskilled and semiskilled. Again, this is not what your congregations are going to be composed of; let's face it. Tailor your ministry to what you know your congregations will be—college educated and salaried men.

"But how can I get a job? I'm not trained for anything but the ministry," you say. When you graduate, you'll have a three-year degree in working with people that will be very hard to match indeed. Companies will be glad to hire you on that basis. That's really what they're looking for anyway. Standard Oil, Shell, IBM, General Electric, and Procter & Gamble to name a few, are excellent companies and all have some kind of training program; they'll take you from where you are. Tell them you'd like a job in their personnel department. They'd be happy to have a future minister. Tell them exactly what you want to do—put in a good two years for them to get a look at the world of people as you're going to have to minister to them. Be frank; they'll appreciate it.

"But why two years? Wouldn't less time do?" No. In all fairness to what the company has invested in your training, give at least two years. You'll also be cheating yourself if you give less. You want to learn the people, their ways, their thoughts, their interests, and their working environment. You cannot grasp the business-world
atmosphere in less than that amount of time. And after all, that’s what you want.

As to finding a job, answer some corporation ads in the paper. Even better, look at the 1967 College Placement Annual to get a fast summary of different companies, their needs, and what they’re looking for. The Placement Service at Pasadena City College has this. Or write some letters, or call the particular company’s Los Angeles office. IBM has hired one quarter of all its employees in the last three years; that company might be a good place to start. Do a little footwork; it will get results.

As to your church work during these two years, why not continue to help in the kind of part-time work you’re now doing while in seminary? I’m sure most far-sighted ministers would be happy to cooperate with a program such as this. As to your need in the church, it can wait for two years. No church is that desperate, and if it is, it probably acutely needs the type of better-trained minister that this background would produce.

God needs men who are willing to do something extra to meet their generation where they live. Why not give it a thought?

* * *

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor:

Each quarter we students hear the standard lecture from some professors on the necessity for and virtues of required attendance at lectures. This adherence to legalistic duty in the classroom was carried over, during the last quarter, into the scheduling of classes during Finals Week. A number of these same professors, undoubtedly out of the same sense of legalistic duty, very firmly impressed upon their students, the need for attending that last class, and the importance it would have for their completion of the course. Nevertheless, on Tuesday morning, no less than three of these professors (of which I am aware) either cancelled their classes at the last moment, or merely failed to show up to conduct them.

The inconvenience and frustration to students already under the burdensome pressures of finals, are only surpassed by the obvious lack of consistency or the warped sense of legalism which permits the application of the sense of duty in one direction, but not in the other. A large number of (adult) students deserve an apology. However, this, perhaps, is a "one way street" also.

Thomas S. Johnson
VIETNAM! VIETNAM!
by James W. Brown

Was I ever a warm fleshed thing to cry?
No! I drowned in my birth and was early to die!
The tempestuous sea strangled me
And my senses are cold, though I walk and am old!

I discovered me dead when I found I was calm
While confronted with infants burned by my bombs.
Yet I cherished my life more than theirs
And I made me secure at the cost of the poor.

I've some skill pronouncing the patriot's cry
And defending our course as if wisdom should die
When my nation is gone; judged by love's
Deep concern for the child whom my justice defiled.

*****
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MAKE A JOYFUL NOISE
by Linda Walker

The world's a dark, dirt brown
Not a dramatically drawn black.
Wind never carries the sad stench
To higher homes or pulpits;
It smolders in the "immoral dump".
Children are buried under piles of brown
From their first breath,
Suffocating in stench and soured milk.

A hand scratching thru' to find them
Finds only bones and senseless flesh of
Fathers, mothers long past help.

What then options for a hand?
Plant flowers on the filth and pray
OR
Curse the dirt and dig!
Hoping to yet reach a child of forty
Still gasping for breath.

* * * * * * * * * * *
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