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Over the past few months, many changes have taken place in the life of our seminary, changes which reflect the genuine concern of its administration for its student body. We now enjoy the person and work of a Dean of Students. Significant adjustments have been made to improve the ministry division curriculum. Student representatives have been welcomed and listened to by the Ten-Year Planning Committee. Our chapel services have come under the serious superintendence of a Faculty-Student committee, rather than being the ad hoc, "great speaker in town" conclave of years past. At last, a very adequate office has been released to the Student Council for use by the many committees and organizations under its aegis. And now too, it appears that the organ in the chapel has been repaired!

The opinion applauds this sincere and positive attitude on the part of the administration, especially in view of the fact that it is so easy for any administration to become self-satisfied, a grey, bureaucratic end-in-itself. If such a cooperative spirit persists, we can confidently hope that, as other areas of need arise, these too will be faced and resolved speedily and amicably.
TELEVISION AND THE CHRISTIAN VIEWER
by J. Melville White

The average American Christian watches television approximately twenty hours a week.¹ To young and old alike television is an inexpensive and convenient form of relaxation and entertainment. Unfortunately, one seldom questions the cumulative and permanent results of this overexposure to media bombardment. The question must be raised. What is television doing to the average churchman? Or, better yet, what is television doing to you and to me?

Picture a living room in semi-darkness. At one end slouched comfortably in an easy chair is man. At the other end is television. To answer the question "What is television doing to you and to me?" we must clearly examine both the nature of media and the nature of man.

First, what is man? Three thousand years before coaxial cables, satellites or laser beams, the Psalmist David asked it. For two thousand years the Christian Church has asked it. Now, you and I must ask it again. Who is this two legged creature sitting passively before the video screen? What makes him different from the monkeys on DAKTARI or the monkeys on THE MONKEES? What is your doctrine of man?

If it is true that man is different from the monkeys because he was created in the image of God (Imago Dei), and if, in Helmut Thielicke's words, the image of God only exists as a result of man's personal relationship with the Creator, then man's basic task is to share in that relationship. Anything that interferes with this relationship is dangerous to man. Brunner summarized his doctrine of man with, "We are men to the extent that we let God's Word echo in our hearts." Any voice that speaks louder than God's voice, any communications force that has a greater grip on the minds and emotions of man than God is a destructive force. In the light of the Christian doctrine of man, then, examine the effects of television on the Christian viewer. How does modern media effect our relationship with God?

1. Television dominates our time. Only sleeping time surpasses television viewing as the top time consumer among
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American youth. After much research the director of the Catholic's St. Clement Film Society says, "Churchmen join with the rest in spending more time looking at film than they do at any other activity aside from sleeping and working."  

Surveys give us a clearer picture of how much time viewing time actually amounts to in the average man's year. Surveys conclude we spend twenty hours a week, eighty hours a month, 960 hours a year watching television. That amounts to one and one-half months of the year we spend before the screen. A graduating high school senior has watched about 15,000 hours of television programming in comparison to 10,800 hours in school. That is two years of twenty-four hour days spent watching television. Don't compare that with the time spent in church or church school classes or family worship. The results are too discouraging.

There is no denying that much of what we view is entertaining, (and entertainment is necessary to everyman's mental health). Much contemporary programming is educational (THE 21ST CENTURY), informative (MEET THE PRESS, COLLEGE BOWL), and even inspirational (LUTHER). Parenthetically, it would be interesting to see how much "good" television churchmen watch in an average week. Most critics believe that churchmen are no more selective in their viewing than non-churchmen. Some are even convinced that because we Evangelicals have suffered from the Eleventh Commandment so long (THOU SHALT NOT ATTEND THE MOTION PICTURE) we may be even more indiscriminating than the average secular viewer.

The point is this. What could we achieve in personal growth and development in even half the time we spend before the television receiver? How much time do we spend in actively pursuing our "relationship" with the Creator? One Sunday School lad when asked if he ever listened to the voice of God replied, "What channel is it on?" How busy are we really in the light of television viewing habits? Perhaps you plead innocent at the point of wasted time. Next month add up the hours you spend. You may be surprised.

2. Television influences our attitudes. Most churchmen have been convinced by the Television Information Agency propaganda that television is 'good for you.' Even when he admits that he is being manipulated on a consumer level, Christian viewers see no potential danger on the more subtle and permanent levels of man's attitudes. W. W. Charters reports in his MOTION PICTURE AND YOUTH that extensive studies prove "the attitude towards any social value can be measurably

changed by one exposure to a motion picture." His investigators discovered that the effects of motion pictures upon attitudes are cumulative. (That is two pictures are more powerful than one and three are more potent than two.) And Charters continues, "The effects upon attitudes are of substantial permanence."

In the above studies researchers tested significant attitudes including war, crime, the Chinese, capital punishment, punishment of criminals and the Negro. What are the medium's attitudes toward minority races (how many Negroes or Mexicans do you see in commercials, dramas, news casting or features; what roles do they play), or lower classes (how many typical series feature unhandsome men, unpretty women, low class or slum dwellings) or the church (do nuns really fly; do all priests really look like Boris Karloff)?

God's Word has definite instructions about the Christian's attitude toward these and countless other areas. Yet we have far too often found our attitudes molded by another channel. How can the Holy Spirit compete with media when we focus so long and so hard in media's direction? Can the church rebuild attitudes in the brief confrontation it has with her people on Sunday morning or Wednesday night? Students of media can answer without fear of valid contradiction, "no!"

3. Television effects our behavior. Far too long we have maintained the illusion that what we watch has no affect on what we do. It is time the truth was faced. Dr. Leonard Berkowitz reports in SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN that the "violence" fable (viewing violence is purgative or cathartic) is not true. On the contrary observing violence "is more likely to induce hostile behavior than to drain off aggressive inclinations." He adds that viewing violence can stimulate normal persons under appropriate conditions as well as the emotionally disturbed. He reports that "seeing justified aggression causes a person to more easily vent his own hostilities."

Couple this report (and dozens like it) with the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency's report that 20,000,000 children watch network television from 7:00-11:00 p.m. and that sixty percent of that time is focused on violence and you don't need to wonder one reason why the violence in this

country is increasing in hundred percentials. In 1957 the murder rate in America had seen a decrease in 353 major cities for more than twenty years. In 1958 television reached its first saturation level (50 million sets). That year the murder rate began to rise and has risen steadily ever since, especially among American teenagers.

Before the average American child reaches fifteen years of age he has seen more than 20,000 murders "in cold blood." On one episode of Gunsmoke ("DRSf WELL") action included "physical abuse, torture, and almost inhuman insensitivity to suffering" on the part of one character, and the characterizations portrayed included "a fiendish old man, a killer, an unfaithful wife and an amoral son." On NBC's The Virginian one episode, entitled "Man of Violence" included 13 individual killings, 9 by shooting, 2 by knives and gun butts, 1 by torture and 1 by smothering. When FBI officials can say casually that television is standardizing violence across America, how can we sit passively before the screen and permit something to happen to us that no scientist can measure, no doctor diagnose?

4. Television effects our spending. Stan Freeberg says, "The American public has been brainwashed by the 12 million dollars spent annually by Madison Avenue in an attempt to get them to BUY SOME...TODAY." On the consumer level conformity is not such a bad thing. Or so we've said. Thanks to modern media, however, conformity has become a science and ad men its practitioners. On the level of any one consumer good advertising through television can not be indicted for effecting one's spiritual growth. But put together the total effect of Madison Avenue upon the average Christian and you discover there is danger here. Madison Avenue has taken a standard of living and inflated it yearly to higher and higher buying goals. The "necessities of life", therefore, have grown and grown until we've lost all track of 2 billion starving men and women and children across our globe. We have been trapped by media (and a good part of the credit goes to television) into believing that we are doing the economy good by lavishing upon ourselves endless luxuries. We even believe that if we stopped spending on ourselves in such proportion, the entire world economy would collapse.

At this point it is obvious we have been conformed to the spirit of this age. We have been brainwashed. We have be-

---

come a selfish and avarice people. When the Word of God speaks of "lilies", and "foxes", and "Good Samaritans" we cannot hear it. Television is always there reminding us of our own need; quickly we forget about our brother's! "When you do it not unto the least of these you do it not unto me. Depart from me into outer darkness." Does television effect our relationship with God when on the surface it appears to only be asking us to buy Crest? I believe it does.

Each of the above four areas deserves far more extensive treatment and there are many other areas to consider. Fuller Theological Seminary has a responsibility to the church to investigate the theological and psychological effects of modern media. Here theologians and psychologists united in their love for Christ and the church could dare to experiment and explore. Meanwhile, the church waits.

What the average churchmen can and must do seems obvious. It is not television that is evil. It is the way we use or misuse its offerings. Let me suggest a few actions we can take to stop being victimized by media.

1. Put your television set into the closet.
2. Subscribe to a good television guide. Read and underline it weekly. Post the worthwhile programs in entertainment and education in a noticeable place.
3. Bring out your television only when you plan to see something you have scheduled.
4. Watch those programs actively, not passively. Be alert. Don't let anything or anyone manipulate you. Ask yourself continually, "How is this program affecting me?"
5. Learn to stretch during a commercial (or squelch).
6. Begin your own personal study of media and its effects. Visit Universal studios. Read "Cinema as Art". Read a variety of film and television reviews, Saturday Review, Christian Century, America, etc.
7. Turn it off.

And remember, I am not against television. As a student of media I am convinced that television is one of the greatest powers for good in this century, if, and it's a big "if", we learn to make television our servant and not our master.8

The church bells signaled the start of the morning service, and Walter Mittiphos and his wife approached the towering red-brick building with its New England-style steeple pointing skyward. As long-standing members of the church, the Mittiphos' received a friendly welcome from an usher at the door. Mittiphos glanced around the foyer nodding at familiar faces, scrutinizing others, then moved toward the door of the sanctuary.

More smiles of welcome came from those distributing bulletins. Mittiphos paused on the way to his seat to exchange pleasantries with a friend with whom he had had lunch that week. It had been a good week -- his furniture store business, though in the post-Christmas slump season, seemed to be holding its own. Lamps and headboards, mostly.

As he took his usual pew, Mittiphos wondered what the pastor would preach on this Sunday. He scanned the bulletin news items and the order of service until he found the sermon topic: "Let's Get Out of a Rut." The text was Matthew 6:7 -- "But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking."

Mittiphos wondered what the pastor meant by a "rut." His imaginations were cut short by the organ introduction to "The Doxology". Mittiphos rose to his feet with the congregation as the choir and the pastor entered from the side of the platform. Mittiphos sang along effortlessly, glancing across the congregation like a teacher taking attendance. The pastor offered a prayer as the congregation mechanically bowed their heads and closed their eyes. Mittiphos wondered who would win today's football game.

"In Jesus' name...Amen."

Everyone sat down and took out a hymnbook. Mittiphos did not need one; he already knew the words to all four stanzas. The organ played the hymn through, the choir director stood, and the entire church began to sing.

* * * * * *
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Mittiphos sang unconsciously, gazing around at the architecture of the church. It never ceased to amaze him how each Sunday he found something new in its ceiling designs and branching alcoves. His rumination was interrupted momentarily, however, as an usher escorted someone to the pew in front of him. Mittiphos did not recognize the man so he assumed he must be a visitor. Besides, he wore a sport coat and no tie. Mittiphos watched him carefully.

The visitor, seeing everyone using a hymnbook, cautiously took one from the rack and began to fumble through it. Mittiphos leaned over the pew and showed him the page number. The man nodded his thanks and finally found the page: he did not sing immediately, however; he seemed unable to follow the layout of the hymnbook. Mittiphos felt embarrassed that the man was not able to follow the hymnal.

At the close of the hymn the minister offered the pastoral prayer. The visitor was somewhat startled to see everyone close their eyes and bow their heads, but apparently sensing the logic of the practice, condescendingly followed suit. Mittiphos thought it strange that the man was not familiar with the customary manner of praying.

"Our most gracious heavenly Father," the pastor prayed, "we thank Thee for all Thy manifest blessings toward the children of man. We are grateful for Thy regenerating power and Thy redeeming death on Golgotha's brow. This morning, our Father, our hearts acknowledge that salvation comes only through Thy grace, and we thank Thee that we abound in it."

"...and then Saint Peter said, 'Oh, you must be the other guy's brother!'" The entire barracks rocked with laughter punctuated by knee-slap and occasional foot-stomping. Walter Mittiphos lay on his bunk clutching his aching sides as he laughed. He did not think he could stand any more jokes, but as soon as the guffaws subsided, another soldier spun another story.

It was a good way to break the boredom. The war had dragged on for three years, and Mittiphos had spent the last six months in a German prison camp. It could have seemed like six years if the prisoners had not passed the time telling jokes, and fortunately for Mittiphos, the "Krauts" had placed him in a barracks with some of the best comedians in the Allied army; each man seemed to have a story to top his competitors. It made the war seem very far away.

"Hey, Mitts," yelled an American corporal, "c'mere and give us another one of them special Catholic jokes!"
Mittiphos wiped the tears from his eyes, stumbled to his feet, and sauntered to the circle of dungaree-clad court jesters lounging at the other end of the barracks. His mind researched his memory for an as-yet unused “whopper” from the infinite number of stories he knew.

"Didja' hear about the three little kids that came to confession one day?"

"No, man, give us the word," everyone chimed.

"Well, these three little kids came to confession, see. The first one goes into the booth and rattles off a list of sins he'd done that week. Then he says, 'Oh, yeah, Father... I helped throw peanuts in the fountain out in front of the church.' He goes out and the second kid comes in an' does the same thing, listing all his sins for the week. 'Oh yeah, Father,' he says, 'I helped throw peanuts in the fountain out in front of the church.'"

"The Father excuses him, and the third kid comes in and goes through all the sins that he's done during the week. Finally the kid thinks a little more and says, 'Well Father, I guess that's all for this week.' But the Father says, 'Wait a minute. Didn't you help throw peanuts in the fountain in front of the church?' The little kid scratches his head and says, 'Heck no, Father...I'm Peanuts.'"

Again the barracks shook under the cicerless tide of guffaws and joyful shrieks. It lasted about three minutes. Even Mittiphos himself almost died laughing — he was amazed that an old joke could be so funny. In fact, he was amazed that so many old jokes could be so funny.

Unfortunately, as funny as the stories were, the supply was not inexhaustible, and soon it became difficult for even these well-versed comics to come up with fresh material. Everyone had told practically all the jokes he knew, and to retell them did not seem to rock the place as much as before.

However, the ingenuity of the group persisted as long as the boredom of imprisonment lasted, and soon it came up with an idea on how to get more mileage out of the already-repeated jokes. It was decided that each of the jokes would be given a number and that instead of rehashing the joke in its entirety, each one could be retold by simply mentioning its number. Mittiphos thought it was a novel solution.

"Hey, Jerry," yelled an old sergeant squeezing into his dungarees one morning, "number seventy-two!" Jerry laughed,
though not with much gusto.

"What was that?" Mittiphos asked, just emerging from the latrine.

"Number seventy-two."

"Oh, yeah," he laughed. Everyone else joined in the fun.

"That's kinda like number thirty-seven," another retorted. Again everyone laughed, though not quite as raucously as they had the first time around.

The door to the barracks opened suddenly and a German officer marched in with a bewildered-looking British soldier straggling behind surveying the premises. Mittiphos glanced at the man as he made his bed, and since he did not recognize him, surmised that he must be a new prisoner.

"We have captured another one of your allies," the German proudly announced through a broad smile. "May I present Sergeant Hodby, your new comrade. You can use that bunk over there, Hodby," he said tersely, pointing to the vacant bed next to Mittiphos. The sergeant dumped his small duffel bag on the bed and looked around.

"I'm Walter Mittiphos, Second Airborne," Mittiphos said extending his hand. "I wish I could say I'm glad to have you aboard."

"John Hodby, British Intelligence," the new arrival responded accepting the hand. "I wish I could say I'm glad to be here, but I guess it's better than lying in some field with a bullet in your head."

"Well, you'll get used to it, and pretty soon the war'll be over and we'll all be mighty glad of it."

The rest of the guys gathered around Hodby introducing themselves and questioning him as to how he happened to fall into German hands. Mittiphos gave him the cook's tour of the barracks facilities and the camp, and then outlined the work duties for which each barracks was responsible. Hodby seemed still to be in a daze over this sudden turn of fate that had sidelined him from active participation in the war, but nevertheless was resigned to riding the bench.

Later that night after supper most of the men returned to the barracks, and the nightly "Prison Camp Comedy Hour" jumped into full swing.
"Number forty-two," a French private contributed in broken English.

Everybody laughed, "Yeah, man, that was a riot...a real gas!"

Hodby lay on his bunk watching the proceedings and trying to make sense out of his comrades' numbers game.

"Number five," said Mittiphos cracking a smile. Again the group exchanged guffaws and comments.

Hodby watched for about five minutes and then slipped under the covers. He turned on his side facing away from the group and went to sleep as the numbers game continued.

"The offering plate, dear," Mittiphos' wife whispered.

"...huh? Oh, yeah..." he said mechanically depositing his weekly contribution envelope into the plate. Gradually, he regained his bearings and listened to the offertory. He noticed the visitor was scanning the church bulletin and wondered if to him it made any sense....
THE DOCTRINE OF MAN AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
by Stanton M. Olson

This past week God blessed us with one of America's outstanding Churchmen, Reverend Donald P. Buteyn, Minister of Outreach of the First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, California. Seldom have we seen an evangelical minister who exemplifies the wholeness of the gospel as he does by his personal life, his proclaimed work and public example. His Spirit-filled qualities, his "honest" ecumenical spirit, and his deep social concern and involvement will remain with us for a long time.

Biblical and theological soundness concerning the doctrine of man must characterize the mission of the Church. If we think carefully about his ministry to Hippies and other subcultures of students and social classes, we can see an adequate doctrine of man in operation throughout his ministry. First is his motivation of love for God and others, agape love expressed incarnationally. Thus we see his family and he living in the same area and troubled streets as the people to whom he ministers. Another of the doctrines in operation is his emphasis on the quality of relationships between men. The Scriptures have realistically defined human relationships within the boundaries of our human finiteness, image of God and sinfulness before God. Thus, Rev. Buteyn administers tutoring programs and job training from the motivations of responsibility and love for those who begin to realize their greater potential since they have been created in the image of God. Rev. Buteyn shares God's grace for sinful men through relationships with people which were made possible by his structured programs. Many commitments for Christ have resulted and deepened in the last few years.

Many Fuller students sense the Biblically-centered need for a greater awareness and involvement of Fuller as a Seminary in its own community of Pasadena. We must see how Biblical theology relates to everyday life in our own community, how God is concerned with redeeming individuals and the community of Pasadena just as Christ wept over Jerusalem. In doing so, we need to realize that an evangelical motivation and world view is the most realistic and workable basis for involvement in the degenerating situation of race relations.
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in our country. Our motivation and strength is derived from "Christ in us"—His love and the sense of responsibility and compassion that He gives and which is demanded of us in our community situation. The Christians that I knew in the New York Young Life Inner City program are the most dedicated and willing to spend extra "shoe leather" day in and day out with teenagers on the streets of Central Harlem, Lower East Side and Bedford - Stuyvesant areas. This costly, enduring motivation is not based on the narrow defensiveness and fears of many conservative Christians towards the racial situation.

Churches in Pasadena have listened with one ear closed to the desperate cries for attention. Love and fulfillment of need in the image of God that has so often been denied to people of minority groups. Many of Pasadena's churches listen only when threatened. Some reply immediately with a sentimental paternalism that conditions more violence since it keeps Caucasians in political and institutional control and allows some extreme Negro leaders to "get results" or bring in anti-poverty money by playing on the guilt and fears of the established power structure. Others react defensively with a partial truth, something about the sinfulness of men, and then put the blame almost entirely on the minority group. Obviously, this leads to further alienation and problems. Other churches do not even reply which gives the impression that God is not really concerned and Christ is not Lord of all.

Rather, the evangelical can have the most realistic and constructive philosophy in which to face the problems. With an alert awareness of the problems and Christ-centered motivations, the evangelical has the most realistic philosophy in understanding man's finiteness and sinfulness in relation to God and other men, and the most constructive in that a man's potential (the image of God in him) can be more fully realized, given the proper motivation and opportunity to succeed in life. Most important, the evangelical has the greatest hope to offer in the Gospel itself which is able to provide ultimate meaning and to meet man's deepest emotional and spiritual needs. With an adequate doctrine of man, we will not fall into the traps of irrelevancy, non-involvement, or unwarranted optimism or pessimism.

Pasadena seems to possess realistic possibilities for solving its major crises. Dr. Hubbard said at a recent Urban Coalition meeting, "Pasadena has a great potential for solving its problems." He cited the city's abundant technical and scientific knowledge that can send a television camera to the moon. He continued optimistically, "Any community with the resources to accomplish things like these can make
massive headway in the area of human understanding." Pasadena's past and present attempts to meet some of her problems are considerably more courageous than some surrounding communities' "solutions" for fair housing, equal education and democratic values in traditionally Christian communities.

However, Pasadena has swept many problems under the rug. The community has failed to provide adequate vocational opportunities for many youth who are not academically oriented. Out of 20,000 apprentices in the building, electrical, carpentry, and plumbing trade unions in California, none are held by Negroes in Pasadena both in the past and present. In a 1964 survey of the Los Angeles area, 4% of the apprentices were Negro, but none exist in Pasadena. There is no vocational center or school in Pasadena. Course requirements at Pasadena City College require experience or an apprenticeship as a pre-requisite for a course in the trades. Thus, the "system" excludes Negroes from this important area of the world of work. The school system has inferior educational standards for the Negro community. Cleveland Elementary Grade School is overpopulated by approximately 333 children and Washington Elementary and Junior High School by approximately 475 children. The Caucasian ministers meet separately from the Negro ministers of Pasadena. Some of these and other problems are intentionally kept under the rug by administrators in various public positions. This prevents the community from honestly facing and coping with its social problems.

If the Church is to fulfill its whole mission in Pasadena, we must be aware of "what's happening" in our own community. Volunteers for research information and coordinators are needed. Also, Dr. Hubbard has personally asked for volunteers to help research the community's needs in relation to the Pasadena Urban Coalition. He will need students and other interested individuals to do some of the "legwork" by conducting surveys of civic and religious organizations and informal groups of youth and informing them of the Coalition's purposes. Contact Stan Olson, Al Hess or Harry Klassen if you are interested in this service. Our Seminary has an excellent opportunity to fulfill its call to serve people and their needs and build bridges that will more effectively allow persons and groups to see Christ's meaning for their lives in our own Jerusalem and Samaria.
Evangelism, fun and dating were the usual priorities for us in the College Group at Highland Presbyterian Church. For the most part, the first two activities received plenty of attention. As for dating, there wasn't much of it.

Everyone knew what dating meant. For example, Jim's interest in Janet was apparent at our first steak fry. No one was surprised to find them going steady within a couple of weeks. She received his pin at Christmas. You see, dating was for mate picking.

Weren't you supposed to go out with a person who was attractive to you? But for our group that was the problem. Frankly, most of the girls weren't very attractive. Taking them out would be misleading, wouldn't it? You know what a girl's mind turns to during any date; assuming she's half way interested in the fellow, anyway.

Of course, there are always guys like Bob, I guess. He was the big exception and would date everyone. He even took out Sharon. Man, she was the librarian type in every way. But he'd date her as frequently as he dated Bev who was a terrific girl. Bob was the handsome, athletic type and could have gone out with anyone.

It seemed odd, though, that he didn't get overly interested in any particular girl. As you might have suspected, we couldn't quite figure him out. So, I asked him about these "Romeo tactics" one day. The question apparently surprised him because he didn't realize anything unusual was going on. He did admit to discussing what dating was all about with some of the girls, but that wasn't different than what had happened before becoming a Christian last summer. He said he was under less pressure now because he realized physical contact was to be an expression of commitment. Consequently, there was no more "playing around".

Since he mentioned it, I asked about his hand-holding techniques with some of the girls, if he wasn't serious. Also, didn't he realize what happened to a girl when a guy

---
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kissed her? (I knew he had wound up a couple of dates this way.)

Wow! Did he react! You'd think I was a social idiot! He said that where friendship was the nature of the relationship, holding hands was certainly an appropriate physical expression of it. He also felt that kissing can be a legitimate way to express the commitment of friendship. Of course, both parties have to be in agreement about the meaning of this physical communication.

His argument sounded convincing until that last comment. I knew I had him there, and so I pressed the issue. What if one party or the other doesn't really accept such things for friendship alone? Do you know what he said? We all pretty well know what the other person is thinking, and when you're not sure, you find out by talking the issue over. What a riot! Can you imagine talking about that with your date?

It seemed to me that he missed the point, and I told him so. He had to realize that just dating a girl indicated a special relationship was being proposed. Not just friendship! Any degree of physical contact symbolized additional commitment toward marriage.

You're right, he disagreed violently! About everything! In the first place, he couldn't imagine dating only on the basis of mate-picking. He said that girls were too enjoyable to him just as people. Oh, he admitted being turned on by them like the rest of us, but he said that being with them made it possible to understand why you needed God's help to bring you body under control. But, he said, the fun he had and what he had learned from them was too important to pass up. The fun bit I understood, but learning? About what?

Bob believed a girl's intuitive and subjective point of view are essential for understanding ourselves in any area of human activity: politics, history, music, you name it. But what most excited him was how he had learned to find that most every girl he dated turned out to be an interesting person. Even Sharon! Believe it or not, she was a nut about football, and this made their dates fun. Who'd ever have thought it? She's so bookish.

To top it all off he tried to support his thinking from the Bible. Of course he had been a Christian for only a few months, and I doubted the validity of his argument.

In the first place, he claimed that dating for the primary purpose of selecting a mate might not be an act of love
at all. He thought it was actually selfish to show interest only in people who are physically interesting to us. He even called this sin. Get this, when you go out with a girl only if she is attractive to you, you aren't interested in her but just in yourself. He even brought in Christ's command to love everyone with a "no strings attached" kind of love and Paul's statement that for Christians sexual difference is not to interfere with this Love for one another. He actually believed that fellows need girls to help them develop as persons. Now, I understand this last point, but it had to do strictly with building a home and raising a family. As an illustration, though, he told me how Sharon pointed out that ribbing people like he did is actually a way of belittling them and trying to be superior. Now really, does any girl have a right to tell you that kind of thing?

Bob couldn't figure out why there is so little genuine friendship between Christian fellows and girls. It was all the more difficult for him to understand since he had become a Christian largely because Christians showed such genuine love for him. He decided that, at least between the sexes, it was only a thin veneer. The immature extremes of giddy isolationism or "making out" baffled him. He asked me how the non-possessive, selfless, caring love of Christ was active on this level? I saw his point, but to me it's just not practical.

Well, the issue has blown over now. Bob was a senior when he trusted Christ and now works in Schenectady. It's strange we haven't heard from him. Jim and Janet got married, of course. The hardest person to figure out is Sharon. Sure she was quiet, but she always asked questions that forced us to examine our Christian commitment. How she could ever marry a non-Christian fellow I'll never know. And when the baby came in six months Bev really felt guilty about it all. Could it have been that we didn't love her as a person? God help us!
ON SEEING-BEING "THE PAWNBROKER" on T. V.

Each person in his earthly existence means something to someone else, at least once. Whether that someone else be the Father, the Mother, the friend, the lover. And each person wants to mean something to at least one other person, some time. Whether that one other person be the Lover, the Friend, the Mother, the Father.

Somewhere God fits in.

I WANT TO LOVE EVERYBODY; I WANT TO TOUCH AND KISS AND LOVE EACH INDIVIDUAL IN THIS WHOLE WORLD: I WANT TO BE EVERYBODY'S FRIEND, INDEED. I WANT TO THROW MEANING INTO, BE MEANING IN, GIVE MEANING TO Each person in his earthly existence...

Right here God fits in.

God says, go on and write. write what you feel because that is what i want you to do. i want you to write now what you will need to remember—know later.

God says, listen to the scenes which keep flicking behind your eyes, and remember the faces. those are not just any faces; those are faces which i created. those are my faces. remember those faces because each one represents a soul just as important as Yours.

God says i love you, and the announcer, and the pawnbroker, and the pawnbroker.

GOD ALREADY LOVES. — Ronald Ulrich

A VOICE AND THE WORD by Ronald Ulrich

I'm new at this seminary game, and I'm not used to viewing many things in terms of separate categories. (I figure that an unqualified generalization is a travesty of God -- both His Person and His Creation.) A distinct, unrelativized, unqualified category is a specie of generalization. This introductory ground-work is being laid in preparation for the corner-stone, and here it is: The doctrine of Man is rela—
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tive to the doctrine of God. The cement for this block I call the doctrine of Me.

God is not so much concerned with what we are as He is concerned with what we can become. For this reason He sent prophets, leaders, kings, and Christ. God ignores the limitations man places on His creation; God side-steps the categories and transcends the generalizations. God chooses to relate to man so that man can become relative to God. Biographically, John writes about Jesus that "...to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God." (John 1:12) Therefore, the doctrine of Man and the doctrine of Me point to what I am and what I have become, relative to God. Of course, conversely, this raises the issue of my relationship with others: how do I, a human, child of God, relate to Man? What is my function? (Please re-read my poem now.)

John the Baptist expresses perfectly the Believer - God Non-believer relationship; a joyful recommendation. John's disciples were wondering what to do about Jesus. John states "My work is to prepare the way for that man so that everyone will go to Him...He must become greater and greater, and I must become less and less. He has come from heaven and is greater than anyone else. I am of the earth, and my understanding is limited to the things of the earth." (John 3:28, 30,31)

Who is going to help the pawnbroker? Who can help the pawnbroker? Who can really help that guy who is so mixed-up in such a complex, complicated mind-world, need-world, heart-world, soul-world that a film can't even begin to capture it all? --Because, a film shows only "moments". And yet millions of ideas and pictures and thoughts and words and feelings and images can go through our minds in moments, and between moments! That is why the Great Physician is always "on call." --For the moments between moments! For the pains of love and of fear. For the ministering of advice and of medicine and of surgery.

Can I do the job? Can Man do the job? Can God do the job?

We can.
VALUES
by T. E. Tweddell

Today is my daughter's birthday. She has attained the towering stature of 33" and the unique age of 2. Two wonderful years of laughter and tears, joys and fears, hard work and happy frolic. Two years of the investment of the lives of two parents in the life of one child. And what is there that a parent won't do for his child? Neither wife nor alarm clock can lever me out of bed in the morning, but a cry in the night brings an almost automatic response -- groping through the darkness to the crib side, the tiny outstretched arms, the fond embrace, the little curly head on your shoulder for a moment or an hour, however long it takes to banish the fearsome "Doggies" or "sirens" or lonely monsters of the night, or to relieve the distress of hunger, dampness or cold. Or the patient hours of answering "What's-zat?" or "Look at dis", of quieting disputes or puzzling over half-formed words. The endless changing of diapers or worried looking at thermometers. Or the frantic rush to the hospital in the grey hours of dawn, a limp and moaning child in your arms, the pounding of your heart and sick clutch of fear in your stomach, the doctor's knitted brows, the sharp cry of infant pain, and finally -- the calm assurance that whatever it was is past and she should soon be well.

Two years past and more to come. And what is it for? You dream of the future, you want it to be warm and happy and bright. A life of purpose and love and freedom. A chance to serve and worship God. A life of work and love and service to mankind. A chance to grow and live without the choking bounds of fear. A chance to say and do what is right and just, before Almighty God and among your fellow men. Note, a chance is all I ask. We cannot guarantee the future for our children but we must demand their opportunity.

But let us change the scene--the year is 1949. The one-time 'bandits' of the southern hills are now become the Lords of China. Their Liberation Armies have swept the old order into the sea. The people carry on, the government is none of their concern. Governments rule the people, not the people the Government. That is how it has always been, that is how it is now. But this government is different from the
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last one. A strict orderliness prevails, banditry is stamp­
ed out, inflation is halted with an iron hand, officials are
honest -- on pain of death. But as abuses disappear, free­
doms disappear also. A pass from the police is required for
all travel, even to the next town 5 miles away. Religious
freedom is the law, but both ultimate and immediate loyalty
must be to the state, not to God. Free enterprise is allow­
ed, but when property taxes equal 100% or more of a good
year's yield, double or triple a poor year, no one wants to
buy land. Soon the government owns most of it. Economic
equality and agricultural reform are instituted, as promised,
if not as expected: "Take from the rich and make everybody
poor" becomes a fact not a witticism. But these are only
minor hardships compared to the major burden -- an all perv­
vading atmosphere of crushing Fear. Fear is the real essence
of Communist rule. Love is the antidote to fear, the Com­
munists use only Hate. Hate the Nationalists, Hate the Im­
perialists, Hate the Americans. Americans are depicted on
wall posters bayonetting babies, blood drips from tattered
American flags. But the hate goes deeper than that. You
must hate the old ways, hate your parents who practice them,
hate reactionism, hate deviationism, hate creativism, hate
your friends, hate yourself. And hand in hand with hate
comes fear. Fear of your enemies, fear of your neighbors,
fear of your children, fear of your associates, fear of your closest friends -- for if they know
you intimately they may unwittingly betray you.

If I lived there instead of here, my little girl would
not learn to color pictures that say "Peace and Joy at
Christmastime to Grandmother and Grandfather". They would
say "My Grandmother is a reactionist, she is an enemy of the
people." Instead of learning to sing "Jesus loves the little
children" she would sing "Hate the American, Kill the Imperial­
ists!"

I do not dream this up, it happens every day! And
Chinese are no different from Americans when it comes to hu­
man values. Human hearts are the same everywhere, both phy­
sically and figuratively. Fathers and Mothers want to love
their children, and children want to love their Fathers and
Mothers -- unless they are taught differently. But this is
hate instead of love, fear instead of joy. Where now are
the things we dreamed of, the warmth and brightness, the life
of purpose and love? Where is the chance to serve and wor­
ship God, the chance to love and serve mankind? Before
that chance will come, many must suffer and die.

What sacrifice are we willing to make that our children
may have a chance to love a life of meaning and purpose and
fulfillment? Surely we would be willing to suffer and die if that be necessary. And what sacrifice are we willing to make that the children of others may have this same choice? Surely we can do no less. We as a nation are engaged in mortal combat in Vietnam. The issues are blurred and our motives are confused. Some Americans are moved by selfish reasons. Some by pride. Others are indifferent, many simply ignorant. They eulogize the "happy Communist" much as others eulogize the "happy heathen" not realizing that even as the "happy heathen" is ridden with disease and gripped by fear of supernatural powers, so the "happy Communist" is in reality on the verge of starvation and overshadowed by constant fear. He is not motivated by nationalism or political persuasion, but by an ideological diabolicalism that is not satisfied with men's bodies but must possess their minds and souls as well.

The real question in Southeast Asia is not one of economics or politics. It is a question of values. It is a question of "What price Freedom"?

For those interested in getting an accurate picture of Asian Communism in action the following books are recommended:

*Escape from Red China* by Robert Loh and Humphrey Evans: an autobiographical account of an American educated Chinese who worked himself high enough in the Communist hierarchy to get out of the country.

*The Bamboo Cross* by Homer Dowdy: the true story of Vietnamese Communism in its earlier stages amongst the Montagnard in South Vietnam.
WHY I OPPOSE OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM
by Robert McAfee Brown

The title sounds negative. It is. At the moment, persons who disagree with our Vietnam policy do not have the option of putting alternatives into practice. Only Mr. Johnson can do that, and he's not listening. So the first, and at the moment major, obligation of those who disagree with our policy is to persuade enough voters that it is wrong — strategically, tactically, and morally wrong — so that the voices of opposition will increase to such a pitch that they can no longer be ignored. Only those dissatisfied with our policy will be interested in alternatives to it.

Here, then, are some of my reasons for an opposition that becomes more deep-seated every day I live.

1. I cannot accept as valid the reasons we give for being in Vietnam.

Administration officials repeatedly tell us why we are in Vietnam and why we must stay there. Increasing numbers of Americans are not satisfied with their reasons. Here are some of the reasons officials offer:

"We are in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression from the north." The facts are too controvertible to make this a basis for justifying our presence. Many Southeast Asian experts insist that the war in Vietnam began as a civil war in the south, into which America increasingly intruded, and that significant "aggression from the north" began only after the massive American buildup was underway. Two of the best books on Vietnam — Draper, Abuse of Power (Viking), and Kahin and Lewis, The United States in Vietnam (Dell) — provide documentation.

"We are in Vietnam to honor our commitments to the South Vietnamese." The "commitments" were made to the Diem regime, a puppet regime of ours, upheld by our power, a regime not representative of the people. Those who appeal to the SEATO treaty as the justification for our military presence need to be reminded that only long after the fact was this officially offered as a rationalization for our presence, as
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Arthur Schlesinger makes clear in *The Bitter Heritage* (Fawcett). We are supporting South Vietnamese governments that have been repressive military dictatorships and that could not survive among their own people were not our prestige and power behind them.

"We are in Vietnam to halt the expansion of world Communism." This argument is overly simplistic, since it assumes that there is a monolith known as "world Communism" everywhere and always the same, to be dealt with identically wherever it is found. But even a pro-Administration political scientist such as Robert Scalapino of the University of California has said that monolithic world Communism is a "Non-issue." The monolith has been crumbling for twenty years. There are Communist countries, indeed, but they are not identical; and in them the power of nationalism is a power greater than Communist ideology.

North Vietnam has no desire whatever to be dependent upon China, and its history has been a constant struggle to maintain independence. And yet the more we bomb North Vietnam, the more we force Ho Chi Minh into a dependence upon China for military aid. Thus our military action undermines our political intent, and we shore up the very monolith we wish to destroy.

Such justifications as the above have been the stock-in-trade of Administration spokesmen for several years. But recently the State Department, through Mr. Rusk, has given us a new reason:

"We are in Vietnam to protect ourselves from China's imperialist ambitions." Mr. Rusk now warns us about the billion Chinese who will be armed with nuclear weapons in a few years. It now appears that North Vietnam is no longer the real enemy, but that China is, and that it is our own national interest that is at stake in Vietnam. There is an admirable candor in this admission, for it no longer makes any pretense that we are fighting nobly on behalf of the Vietnamese. But I am appalled by its moral implications: for it says that we are willing to destroy a nation and its people, to use the Vietnamese North and South, as pawns in a power struggle in which we are engaged to save not their skins but ours.

"Perhaps we shouldn't have gotten into Vietnam, but now that we're there we must stay and win." This is the argument I hear most frequently: we may indeed have blundered badly, but there is nothing to do now but brazen it out. Our national honor is at stake. After all, America has never lost a war.
The argument is the height of folly. It is saying, "We made an error, therefore let us compound that error." It is saying, "We should not have sent men there at all, therefore let us send more men." This is strange and tragic logic, for it finally translates into the logic of victory at any price. No matter what it takes - the destruction of Vietnam, the slaughter of her people, the involvement of China, or whatever - we must win.

2. I cannot accept what the war is doing to Vietnam.

We should not be there fighting in the first place. But we are there, and we are fighting. What, in the second place, is our fighting accomplishing?

The American presence in Vietnam is destroying a nation in the name of liberating it. Acknowledging the misery that Vietcong terrorism has produced, it is far from self-evident that the South Vietnamese are in better shape today than before we came, or that they have any reason to look upon our presence as a blessing. For what does our presence mean to the Vietnamese?

It means hundreds of thousands of peasants forcibly evacuated from their homes, "Refugees" that we create by military order, confined to what can only be compared to concentration camps.

It means hundreds of villages utterly destroyed by us as a matter of "military necessity," an operation poignantly described by Jonathan Schell in The Village of Ben Sa.

It means a war in which civilian casualties are incredibly disproportionate to military casualties, a war in which Americans may now have killed as many as half a million civilians.

It means destruction by Americans of vast acreages of crops by defoliation from the air.

It means the use of herbicides to destroy crops on earth.

It means women and children and aged burned to death or hideously and painfully disfigured by the American use of napalm.

It means prisoners tortured not only by the Vietcong but by Americans and South Vietnamese soldiers, in violation of all the rules of international warfare.
It means, in short, the destruction of everything the people of this land hold dear: their homes, their families, their livelihood, their customs, their past, their future.

This is what we have done. I sometimes feel that when the war is finally over thousands of us must go to Vietnam simply to work under the Vietnamese and help them rebuild their land. And then I wonder why a Vietnamese peasant would ever want to see an American again. I conjecture that some of them would rather starve than accept food from our hands, would rather die than ever again be beholden to a man with a white face.

In the near future, a lengthy report that documents the above charges will be issued by Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam, on the erosion of moral constraint in our waging of the war in Vietnam.

We do all this in the name of "victory." But what will victory mean after such a war as this? Those who talk about "pressing on to victory" have singularly little to say about what the term means. It is clear, of course, that we could bomb Hanoi back to the Stone Age, as General LeMay prescribes, and that we could even pave Vietnam over with asphalt and have the boys home by Christmas, as Ronald Reagan prescribes. From perspectives as wild as those, we have indeed practiced restraint. But long before those objectives were achieved, we would surely have escalated the war to the use of atomic weapons and involved either Russia or China or both and thus precipitated World War III. Even if we could win a military victory in Vietnam short of that, we would not have "won the hearts and minds of the people." As Jonathan Mirsky points out in a perceptive first-hand report ("The War Is Over," Ramparts, December, 1967) we have already lost the hearts and minds of the people, who would like to see us leave. And if we propose to stay until all pockets of guerrilla resistance have been wiped out, the most optimistic military estimates suggest that this could take from ten to fifteen years.

These are the gifts to the Vietnamese of our presence.

3. I cannot accept what the war is doing to America.

The real horror is what the war is doing to Vietnam. But the war is doing things to America also. While we cannot blame all of our domestic crises on Vietnam, we must realize that they are magnified, almost beyond possibility of solution, by the war. The war is costing us close to $30 billion a year. Even a fraction of that sum expended on behalf of civil rights, or the rehabilitation of the ghettos, or the
extension of opportunities for education could transform the face (and soul) of our nation. What America should become at home, particularly in relation to its ill-used minority groups, is prevented by the war.

The war is also numbing the moral conscience of America. We were shocked in World War II when the Nazis forcibly removed civilians and destroyed their homes and villages, in what was called a "scorched earth" policy. Yet we do this constantly in Vietnam, and no one is shocked any more. We call it "Operation Cedar Falls." Men manufacture napalm with no sense whatsoever that it is one of the ugliest instruments of human destruction ever devised. We use antipersonnel weapons that are designed not to destroy buildings but to lacerate human flesh, weapons that make no distinction between soldiers and nursing mothers, between Vietcong and four-year-olds. We train our eighteen-year-olds to strafe villages populated by civilians, to shoot first and ask questions afterwards, to destroy civilian centers of population, to drop bombs on sampans, to set fire to huts, to burn rice fields. And we are not ashamed.

The war is stifling the democratic process. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Rusk claim to believe in the right of dissent; but they clearly do not believe in its practice. They equate dissent with giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and imply that it costs American lives and prolongs the war. The only conclusion to be drawn from their argument is that dissent is unpatriotic and disloyal. Congressman Hebert of Louisiana would "forget the First Amendment" in order to get dissenters into jail. General Hershey has ordered draft boards to reclassify dissenters as 1-A and draft them, thus turning the draft into a means of punishment. Governor Reagan urges that we formally declare war so that dissenters can be charged with treason. Our new Selective Service Act makes no provision for conscientious objectors to war save for those who are absolute pacifists. We thus give the majority of our young men who in conscience will not fight in Vietnam no alternative save to go to jail—or leave the country for good. This is the tribute our nation pays to conscience. Those who most loudly bewail "student protest" ought to realize that we give students no option save protest when we deal so brutally with their consciences.

The war is stifling the democratic process in a further and ominous way. This has become almost exclusively "Mr. Johnson's war." He is the one who makes the decisions. He has taken from Congress the power of decision in relation to war that Congress constitutionally ought to have. Congress forfeited its right, at Mr. Johnson's insistence, in August,
1964, in the Gulf of Tonkin agreement. This may prove one of the most costly mistakes in American history, for Mr. Johnson is not one to give up power he has gained. As he informed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee through Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, even if the Gulf of Tonkin agreement were abrogated, he would simply continue to do what he is doing. In a democracy, one branch of government is supposed to be answerable to the other branches. Mr. Johnson is no longer answerable to anyone but himself. The only check Congress has left is the power of appropriations for the war; and few congressmen, as Mr. Johnson well knows, are about to take the stand that we should stop "supporting our boys."

All of this leads me and many other Americans to a serious crisis of confidence in the Administration. The "credibility gap" is no figment of some diseased imagination. It is a product of Administration duplicity. When one recalls Mr. Johnson's campaign promises of 1964 not to escalate the war, and compares those promises with what he did almost immediately after taking office, i.e., escalate the war and continue to escalate the war, it becomes difficult to be confident when he makes other public promises. When a State Department official categorically denies that we have bombed civilian targets in Hanoi, and Harrison Salisbury (who was there) reports that we did, confidence in the State Department is similarly eroded. It is a fearful thing to have lost confidence in one's leaders, but another price of the war has been to force many Americans to the uncomfortable conclusion that their leaders cannot be trusted.

(Dr. Brown's article will be continued in the March issue of the opinion.)
Dear Sir:

While appreciating the response of Merry Stewart, who in her own way sought to defend me in my "fundamentalistic" commitments, I do believe she missed my point.

Most of my critics—you know, those who struggle for "truth" over against the plain teaching of the Gospel—would go along with Merry. They, too, have been nurtured in the cradle of "fundamentalism", and as best they can seek to acknowledge this debt while striving to be free from its weaknesses.

But what my critics—and possibly Merry Stewart—forgot is that this token capitulation, that of acknowledging the strengths of "fundamentalism" (a term I never use), is by no means adequate. What I am defending is a whole hearted support of the "fundamentalistic" mentality.

What I am proposing as the "plain truths of the Gospel" are those things which have been acknowledged by all pious men at all times (at least since Finney and Billy Sunday): i.e., that the "individual" is the primary and essential category of Christian anthropology; that "private" faith ("my experience," etc.) is the measure of truth; that "historical considerations" are of no concern in one's attempt to understand the faith; that the corporate category is useless if not misleading; and that pragmatic considerations are ultimately the most effective means for ordering the Christian life. These truths are the eternal verities (along with some other more theological verities).

You see, Merry missed the point. Ultimately she will be swallowed up by the catholic mentality. She came closest to my stance when, at the end of her letter, she asked us to beware of the "heady wine" of theological sophistication (I would go further than that, of course. Cf. my earlier letter.) She cautions the one disenchanted with fundamentalism to avoid "brick-throwing" tactics. As a matter of fact, it was I who threw the first brick.

At any rate Merry struck a sympathetic chord when she mentioned one of my favorite tunes, one that rings with anthropocentric sublimity, "Bringing in the Sheaves."

Marvin Schack, B.D.

Dear Sir:

Chapel procedure: what has it been? What could it be? As the chapel committee has said, "the function of the Chapel Service is for corporate praise and prayer", and with this most of us would agree. We should acknowledge the worth of God in worship. I appreciate what the committee has been trying to do, putting some structure into this aspect of seminary life. But after living with it for more than a quarter
now, I feel we have swung to an unbalanced expression of corporate worship. A seminary is a place where we should be exposed to the best of the old, but also encouraged to experiment with the new, at least when it comes to our pattern of worship. One of my impressions of Fuller Seminary is that it is very advanced in the area of curriculum. However, when it comes to chapel, I find little that inspires the imagination. There is a drab sameness about our chapels. Thus to the powers that be in control, and to my fellow students, I offer two proposals for consideration.

First, instead of a regular chapel on Wednesday, why not have what we might call an "experimental chapel". It might even take on the nature of an assembly if the program seemed to warrant giving time to it. But usually it would be a worship chapel as was suggested is the purpose of getting together. If we let our minds expand a little, we might all be surprised at what creative and meaningful forms of worship might emerge. At the very least we would have a chance to experience varied patterns, rather than rejecting them on theoretical grounds that they do not conform to our present structure. Let me suggest a few programs which might be tried during the third quarter.

a. Sermon in dialogue. I have never had the opportunity to hear one, but would like to. Couldn't this be a legitimate form of worship? Or along the same line could be a debate between two professors or students on a hot issue confronting the modern Church.

b. Chanting session. If you have ever been to a Jewish synagogue, you will remember the beautiful chanting of the Psalms. Of course we would need to get some music, but surely Christians could adapt it to their corporate worship. Antiphonal singing might be used too.

c. Silent vigil (or meditation). A program like this would remind us that in order to worship we don't always have to be vocal. A theme might be chosen for meditation, and dents come and go as they desired. Or everyone who goes might spend the time kneeling in prayer. You don't have to kneel to pray, but sometimes it helps.

d. Audio-visual display. In this modern age of celluloid and sound tracks, is there any reason we should not have a worship experience by viewing a short film or listening to a tape. We have hardly seen any of this recently, but there must be many good aids available.

e. Hymn sing. It might be very inspirational just to sing for the whole session. Other instruments than piano and organ might be included to enrich our appreciation of them. Some good old gospel songs could be thrown in, and even a new selection or two.

f. Contemporary drama. A brief Christian drama could be presented, or a choral reading given a try. Even a top
notch book on worship could be read and discussed and related to our own experience. It would certainly not hurt to try something like this once a quarter.

g. Add your ideas. I am sure there are dozens more if you simply let them come to the surface. The important thing is to get started.

Second, small prayer groups could be initiated, for instance, on Thursday, instead of regular chapel. Then chapel would continue as it has been on Tuesdays and Fridays, with the two days in between having a more flexible type of worship pattern. We are living in a day when small groups, ten or so members, are back in fashion. People (and seminary students are persons too) seem to desire the personal warmth of a small fellowship. I am convinced that most of us here at seminary would profit by 15-20 minutes a week praying and sharing with a little cell group. This would meet the needs of students who feel that corporate worship is not personal enough. There is no Biblical reason why we need to have a "churchy chapel" everyday. And these small groups could also be optional.

From the above proposals you may gather that I am dissatisfied with the present chapel procedure. To put it mildly, I am. I hear professors occasionally lamenting the poor chapel attendance. But can you blame students for not coming? It is the same, same, same, or almost so. Who likes to eat hot dogs for lunch every day? There are also tacos and hamburgers and fish sandwiches. Or who likes to take only theology courses? Or ministry? Or only Biblical studies? Yes, even the curriculum provides us with a balanced diet. And I would like to see a more "balanced" chapel program. The experimental chapels and the small group prayer meetings are suggested as a partial solution. They might be compared to our special interest seminars. If there is something worthwhile in chapel, students will come. They won't need to be asked to support something they are not really interested in. I expected more "evangelical fervor", more aliveness, from a so-called "evangelical seminary". Perhaps some of this is lost because of our formal traditional worship patterns. We have been well inoculated against saying "Amen" or "Praise the Lord!" in our worship. When I graduate in 1969 I expect to take with me the best things I have learned here at Fuller Theological, in classes and in informal discussions. But I cannot honestly say that chapel has been one of the highlights of seminary life so far. F.T.S is a good seminary, but I am of the opinion that it can be even better if it develops the chapel service with the same pioneer spirit it used in developing the present curriculum.

Fritz Sprunger