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The faculty of our seminary have responded in an unprecedented way to a problem which they see is in need of serious attention. That problem is two-fold: the conflict in Vietnam itself and the need of potential ministers for reliable information on that conflict. The unprecedented response is the cancellation of classes on April 17th for the purpose of attending a conference on the war at California Baptist Seminary. The School of Theology at Claremont will also be participating.

The conference is designed to stress what most of us need at this point in our thinking about Vietnam: information that is of good quality. To this end our day at Cal Baptist will have a three-part structure:

1) Objective - Professor of Political Science at Cal Poly Pomona, Mr. Bruce Young, will discuss the history of Vietnam and of the U.S. involvement. He will also present the various interpretations of this history as seen by doves, hawks, etc. Dr. Bernard Ramm will then outline the just war theory in its historical-theological context.

2) Subjective - A panel is in the process of being secured, whose members will include a hawk, a dove, an administration supporter, a black militant, and a radical of sorts. Each of these men will have 15 minutes to present their point of view.

3) Personal - The Christian response to what we have learned will then be developed. Two ministers from the Council of Churches with somewhat different approaches will lead our thinking, with audience interaction possible at an "open mike."

Mel White will be the conference moderator. Several faculty members are "requiring" attendance, while all have strongly recommended by their dismissing of classes that we students take seriously our responsibility to become more informed on an issue that is of grave moral concern to our nation, to the students with whom we in campus ministries will work, to the people, young and old, in the churches we will shepherd.

The planning of the conference indicated that we will not be subjected to a propaganda campaign by the proponents of a single viewpoint. A serious effort at representativeness and objectivity is being made. Such an endeavor meets our needs and deserves our whole-hearted support.
NEW WINE FOR OLD

With this issue of the opinion the services of the present staff of editors come to an end. It has been our privilege to work with the students and faculty of the seminary at the task of both reflecting and stimulating our community's life and thought. The response to the new format has been gratifying, as has been the reaction to the opinion's content. As the editors of Time must have been pleased when the late President Kennedy said that although he did not always agree with the magazine he always read it, so our hearts were "strangely warmed" when President Hubbard said, "I am not as dovish as the last opinion." We were being read. That's what counts.

The new staff will be headed by Jeff Silliman, who will be aided by Paul Dutton, Bob Johnson, and an entourage of worthies and notables who have not yet resolved to risk their fortune and sacred honor by being officially associated with this mag. Our support of the opinion is vital to its fulfilling its role. Prayer, articles, poems, prayer, significant term papers, prayer, insignificant term papers, letters to the editor, Marvin Shack, and prayer are all needed to make our journal an important part of our life together.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank publicly Tom S. (for "Sanctimonious" in view of the clerical collar routine of late) Johnson for the long, long hours he has put into difficult task of preparing the opinion for printing. To Monte Swanson, Chuck Twombly, Jeff Silliman and Paul Roberts I express thanks for their patience with my last minute way of doing things and for their diligent efforts each month in bringing another issue into being. (Lately, though, CLS has been quite preoccupied with other extra-curricular activities.)

From all of us to all of you, adieu!

TFJ

CORRECTION

Responding somewhat slowly to Robert Hubbard's urgent and repeated plea, the opinion retracts its statement that Mr. Hubbard was a graduate of Westmont, and reports that he is on the contrary an alumnus of Wheaton.
The problem of distinguishing the proper boundaries of Christian independence within the secular state has been argued by theologians since the fourth century, when the Civil Order and the Church began their experiment of mutual co-existence. Indeed, their proper relationship has been an enigma for sixteen hundred years.

During the first three centuries of its existence, the Church found itself confronted by a hostile State. With the accession of Constantine, however, it entered into a new era; though impoverished and weakened by the bloody and destructive persecutions of years past, the Church now began to receive new strength in the form of lands, exemptions, revenues, and privileges. In effect, so overwhelmed was the Church with this newly found imperial favor that it failed to react against a subtle intrusion of imperial absolutism; it failed to realize that a benevolent Catholic ruler could be as dangerous to its rightful independence as a pagan despot.

It was not long, however, before the Church began to realize the dangers of caesaropapism, and, then, to wage war against it. And, after many hundreds of years of bitter and sometimes bloody conflict between the spiritual and temporal kingdoms over power and jurisdiction, the problem seemed solved on American soil as men of great wisdom and good will established a free church in a free state. Yet, it seems that this noble experiment has not proved as successful as was at first expected; like the young Church of the fourth century, the contemporary American Church has, in the hope of finding peace and prosperity, given up much of its rightful independence. Protected by the finest and most far-reaching constitutional guarantees in the history of the world, it has willingly and of its own accord become subservient to and a spokesman for the State.

The forces which have moved and directed the development of the American Church in this direction are not unlike those that created the German Christian Movement prior to the Second World War. In order, then to establish a paradigm from which we can evaluate the inadequacies of our own situation, let us attempt to understand the thinking and the emotional tide which moved in pre-war Germany toward
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the establishment of a nationalistic church.

Historically, the Church in Germany has been closely bound to the government: lands and revenues from the state provided the economic basis for its existence. A special church tax was collected by the government from all who claimed church membership, and was distributed to the local congregation for the support of its ministry and service. The German minister was, in fact, an official of the state; he was paid by it, and to some extent he was controlled by it. And, as a consequence the Church was forced to be obedient in matters that "properly concerned" the secular authority.

With the defeat, therefore, of Germany in 1918, the Church suffered a severe blow. The new German constitution declared that there was no longer to be a State Church. The old tie of Throne and Altar was gone, but instead of undertaking a sober rethinking of their prophetic ministry within the State, a majority of churchmen began to lament. "Instead of questioning the fatal line from Frederick the Great to Bismarck and then to Kaiser Wilhelm, the Church thanked God for its political leaders." Indeed, the desire to reforge the link between a strong government and the Church was almost irresistible. Yet, at the same time, there existed within the Church a minority of men who favored the provisions of the new constitution. The two poles in the pre-war German Church, therefore, consisted of those who wished to purify themselves through a program of discipline, and those who wished the people and the Church to be one and the same.

Basic to the thinking of the majority of German Christians was a facile equation of the message of the Bible with the historical milieu in which they had their being. This was the theological tradition into which the German Church had been brought by the great nineteenth and early twentieth century liberals who emphasized the immanence of God. Immanence is the term used to denote the nearness or presence of the indwelling God in his creation. And, traditionally, Christian theologians have asserted the immanence of God. But, never has it been acceptable to emphasize this side of the question to the exclusion of a doctrine of divine transcendence; historically, the Church has rejected both Deism and Pantheism. So far as God is thought of as immanent, he is regarded as sustaining and preserving his creation; so far as he is thought of as transcendent, he is regarded as having power and authority unbounded by this world. Transcendence suggests the freedom of God to be immanent, but it also declares that God is never so caught up in human affairs that he loses his authority over his creation as a whole.

This was the full blown theological error of the German
Christians; they emphasized the immanence of God to the exclusion of a practical doctrine of transcendence. And, as a result, it was an easy step from the historical declaration that Luther marked the emergence of the German people into the Christian world, to the conclusion that Germany was destined by God to play a leading role in the shaping of Christian history.

Had this conclusion been drawn in any other period, it is doubtful that it would have had such cataclysmic results. But, since liberal theology and secular totalitarianism hold in common the thesis that the message of the Bible has to be adapted to the requirements of the secular world, the emergence of these theological conclusions at a period of time marked by the rise to power of a secular despot gave credence to the despot and secular power to the church. Indeed, it was not long before a movement began to combine the teachings of Nazism with those of Christianity; men who wanted to be proud of Germany began to demand the exclusion of all "un-German" thought and activity from the German Church. The teachings of National Socialism became "Christianity" for the majority of Germans, and for this reason, Joachim Hossenfelder, prior to the elections of May 26, 1932, was able to declare that "our race, people, and nation are gifts from God, to be kept pure."^4

At the same time, confidence in Hitler as the one political leader who could restore self-respect to Germany grew into "worship" of the man as an equal to Christ. In the minds of the masses, the storms of rage, the hysterical speeches, and the hypnotic appeal of the little man with the wild eyes, Charlie Chaplin mustache, and unruly forelock created the impression that he was indeed heaven-sent. And, Hitler capitalized on this impression by appealing to his heavenly mission. Indeed, Göring has been quoted as saying, "we love Adolf Hitler because we believe deeply and unswervingly that God has sent him to us to save Germany."^5 And, by 1934, this concept was exploited by the Propaganda Ministry by requiring children to learn prose pieces which declared that "as Jesus set men free from sin and hell, so Hitler rescued the German people from destruction."^6

Likewise, the mind of the average churchgoer was sought. In a pamphlet published in Witten Ruhr prior to 1934, the current theology of immanence was buttressed by declaring that "without Hitler there is no National Socialism; without National Socialism, there is no Third Reich; without the Third Reich, There is no German Evangelical Church."^7 And, in his 'Four Articles of Faith for the German people's Church', Dr. Krause declared: "rejecting all that is foreign in our faith, we stand firm on the basis of a hero-Savior and German righteousness, as it is written in
our hearts and declared by the great Leader of our spirit in word and deed."

Certainly, much more evidence could be cited, but the above is sufficient to point out the doctrinal error into which the German Church had fallen, and to establish the fact that this error was one of the foundations upon which Hitler built up his power and authority. Immanence had led to the establishment of a church grounded in one race, one blood, and one soil. No longer did the church stand *vis-à-vis* the secular society as a community of men and women redeemed by God; no longer could the church function as a body charged with the task of reconciliation, for in pre-war Germany, the Church came to be officially equated with the people. It was generally agreed by the German Christians that the Church's role was to concern itself with life after death, and that it was to be obedient in matters that properly concerned the temporal affairs of men. To be sure, there was some support for this from historic Lutheranism (except in so far as changing the Gospel was Concerned), but even staunch Lutherans began to fear the consequences of the Two Kingdom theory as they were being worked out in Hitler's Germany. In 1934, a convocation met in the city of Barmen which challenged the current theological error, a meeting which became the pivotal point around which new discussions and decisions turned with regard to the whole life and work of the church.

Specifically, the error to which this "Confessing Church" addressed itself was the teaching which emphasized the immanence of God to the exclusion of a doctrine of transcendence. As the theological genius of the Confessing Church, Karl Barth took pains to point out that what he opposed was not a political system but a theological perversion; he was not anti-nationalistic, but anti-heretical. And, the document which was born of the Barmen conference was mainly a statement of faith written, as so many of the classical creeds of the Church were written, to refute error.

It was this kind of resistance that the faithful at Barmen offered. It was not for their own lives that they fought, nor for the continued existence of the German Church, but for the purity of the faith in a time when the State was claiming prerogatives which belonged to God alone. An example of this is seen in a letter from Helmuth von Moltke to his wife shortly after he was tried and convicted of treasonable activity. In that letter he wrote that the decisive pronouncement in his trial was: "Count Moltke, Christianity and we National Socialists have one thing in common, and one thing only; we claim the whole man." To this, Barmen answered, "We reject the false doctrine, as though there were areas of our life in which we would not belong to Jesus Christ, but to other lords."
But, while Germany has already had its Barmen, America has never really faced up to the fact that she too is fostering the establishment of a church grounded in blood and soil. Nevertheless, American churches are, in fact, closely tied to the State. The civil authority has provided for a tax-exempt status for church property; church-related institutions of higher education are eligible for Government loans for buildings; ministers serving as chaplains in the Armed Forces are paid by the government; and church-related hospitals and welfare agencies receive support from tax funds under specified conditions. Indeed, church and state are not so much separated as they are harmonized in well defined ways.

From the beginning of American history, personal self-interest has found an ally in the more abstract Protestant goals. Protestantism has amalgamated with "Americanism," and under a system of official separation, the church has come to be identified nationally with its country's political and economic system. To be sure, the evangelical church in America has never trod the path of the German Church in the sense that it has overtly affirmed the immanence of God in its own particular form of government or in its national destiny. Yet, from the beginning of American history there has been extant in its "collective unconscious" the feeling that somehow the New World is special, that somehow God has smiled upon America with a little more pleasure than upon any other country. The opportunity to begin all over again in the new land was seen by many as taking place under the infinite wisdom and providence of the Christian God whose will was to be seen in the events of America's unfolding history. "Thus the Americans, those new men, came to look upon themselves as a peculiar, a chosen people, set apart by God to serve a peculiar purpose in the history of mankind..." And, though clothed in various terminology at various times and places, this pursuit of Paradise motif, this theme of America's God-given destiny has remained the same.

Therefore, with the establishment of the American dream, the centuries of strife which centered around the question of the relationship of church and state seemed to have come to an end. But, as in the case of the church under Constantine, the American church solved one problem only by creating another. Thus, it is not difficult to understand why the religion of many Americans is democracy - why their real faith is the democratic faith, for in the amalgamation of the American ideal with the Protestant ethic there was created a uniquely American slant on things. In an age, therefore, of communist threat, Americans feel compelled to look to the democratic ideal as the will of God, for it is "obvious" that America stands challenged, and with America,
the Kingdom of God.

What has happened then, in America is that a more subtle form of Church-People alliance has been formed. Certainly, this has not taken on the odious formulations of the German Christian movement, yet the two share many similar characteristics. And, basic to those characteristics is an overt or covert emphasizing of the immanence of God. Nothing else can explain the ministry of a Carl MacIntyre or of a James W. Fifield, Jr., men sincerely declaring what they see to be the Word of God, yet men allowing their interpretation thereof to be filtered through the matter of their cultural heritage.

The question as to the relationship of Church and State, therefore, remains to be answered, for the majority of the classical formulations seem to be more the product of a particular age or culture than the work of honest and solid Christian thought. And, as we attempt to ascertain the Christian perspective, we too must ever be wary of our own cultural heritage (whatever it might be), and never let it become equated with the unfolding will of God. We must ever be reminded of the fact that we are not Americans who have become Christians, but that we are Christians who live in America. In the noble words of the Epistle to Diognetus, "Every fatherland a foreign land, every foreign land a fatherland." Our patriotism must always be viewed in the light of our prior commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord. Never can we allow ourselves to see Christ in the light of our commitment to an economic system, or in the light of our commitment to a political philosophy. As Christians we must serve our nation, but we cannot do it by identifying that nation with the Kingdom of God, nor by seeing our commitment to Christ in the light of a prior loyalty to that nation. Rather, we must see our loyalty and commitment to our nation through our loyalty and commitment to Christ.

When one comes to feel that things are happening in the life of the nation that are not consistent with the Kingdom of God, when one feels that certain aspects of his own personal life, economically, politically and nationally are not consistent with what God has revealed in Jesus Christ and is saying to the Church, one is then in conflict and tension and pain. At this point a Christian best serves his country by speaking words of judgment upon his nation, not in following blindly the dictates of the particular nationalists as did the German Christians. 15

1. In the November 5, 1967 issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, the Reverend Carroll L. Shuster, president of the Southern California Council of Churches, was quoted as saying that the church no longer needs to be afraid of a gov-
ernment takeover. "Now, because of needs the government has expressed, there seems to be a growing awareness that there cannot be any neat separation of the two. I believe that it is possible for the church to stand alongside government, and, without losing its right to speak, share in the fulfillment of some of this need. And, the church can do this while retaining its right to criticize, and the right it has always had in American life to stand off and say what it feels about the condition of man in his environment, without feeling it has been silenced by sharing in the government money used to meet some of the needs in question."

Dr. Shuster is correct in his evaluation. The church can both participate in governmental programs and retain its basic prerogatives. The real problem is much more subtle than mere cooperation; the real problem is culture-protestantism. Whereas the possibility of church-state cooperation can be allowed at the level of organization and program, it cannot be allowed at the level of theological interdependence, that is to say, the separate duties and goals of the Church and the State cannot become intertwined so as to found the Church on blood, race and soil, yet this is exactly where the American Church now finds itself.

3. This is the crossroads where the Church in America stands today. The question before us is one of either purifying ourselves in an attempt to emphasize the difference between our aims and the aims of the world, or of equating the American ideal with the raison d'etre of the Church.
5. Cochrane, loc. cit., p. 24
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Robertson, loc. cit., p. 24
9. An organization of Protestant churches, known as the Confessing Church, including eventually some two thousand parishes spread over most of Germany, was the only continuous and organized resistance to Hitler throughout the period of Nazi power. On the day Hitler seized power in 1933, its forces were in the process of gathering and within a year it was organized nationally around its charter of resistance, the Barmen Declaration. To the Confessing Church it seemed that Germans had been faced both with a problem of priorities and with an inadequate solution to that problem. Hence, the first statement of the Barmen Declaration addresses itself to the question of proper priorities.

12. These things are not so important in themselves, but they become important when the Church fails to adequately assess the loss of prerogatives which she loses upon accepting the help of the State. Thus, there is nothing basically wrong with the requirement that chaplains wear the official uniform of the branch of service in which they serve. But, if the wearing of the uniform carries with it the condition that he comply unswervingly with the official positions of that organization, a condition which would seriously hamper the prophetic role of the minister, then the aid, sanction, and support of that organization costs too much. For a more detailed discussion of this problem, cf. Elwyn A. Smith, Church and State in Your Community (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 4 ff.

13. As Sidney Mead points out, the "Lively Experiment" was embarked upon not so much out of a desire to see the establishment of religious freedom as out of a desire to see political tranquility. The Revolutionary leaders came to see that religious freedom was practically unavoidable; if there was to be a United States of America there had to be national religious freedom. But, the limits of religious freedom were defined by the public welfare. Hence, if a situation were to arise where religious freedom somehow threatened the status quo (i.e., the Mormon's desire to practice polygamy) the state could step in and limit that group's religious freedom. "It is hard to escape the conclusion that each religious group accepted, by implication, the responsibility to teach that its peculiar doctrines, which made it distinct from other sects and gave it its only reason for separate existence, were either irrelevant for the general welfare of the nation-community, or at most, possessed only an indirect and instrumental value for it." Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment; the Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 66.

14. Loc. cit., p. 80

15. Demarest, Gary W., "Even at Risk to National Security," A sermon preached at La Cañada Presbyterian Church, no date given.
Although the second half of Dr. Robert McAfee Brown's letter in the March issue of the opinion was more reasonable than the first, his analysis still suffers from excessive fatuity. Could it be that in his passion for peace in Vietnam, Dr. Brown has left clinically-precise reasoning for the more stirring domains of the heart and the gut? As complementary as these two approaches may be there still is little excuse for substituting the one for the other.

The last year has almost conclusively demonstrated to some the futility of arguing any position from the "facts" of Vietnam. That we all are victims to a greater or lesser extent of the "information gap" can hardly be denied; yet we must apply what logic we possess to the sparse data available. In Section 4 of Dr. Brown's letter, he initially argues that the United States has not responded to peace feelers from Hanoi. We are led to believe, by omission, that North Vietnam made no preconditions in these approaches, which is only to descredit the mentality of Ho Chi Minh. Then Dr. Brown states that we will not stop the bombing of the North as a precondition for talks when exactly the opposite has been the public statement of the Administration. But the important point in these proposals by our government is the assurance from Hanoi that talks will succeed this stoppage in short order. Although the bombing of semi-primitive North Vietnam has not achieved our strategic objective of stopping her support of this war, it has made this supply vastly more difficult and has tied up hundreds of thousands of people in sustaining it. To stop the bombing only to watch our troops get ground up while Hanoi decides whether or not to negotiate is more "possible cost" than we are willing to accept. In fact to reduce military pressures at all during negotiations may be to forget the lessons of Korea and to provide once more the long term propaganda platform the communists earnestly covet.

Dr. Brown concludes this section by speaking of the nadir achieved by our "moral stock" in the market of world righteousness. He speaks of "trust" and "believe" when the building blocks of international politics are power and assurance. His bathos reaches its summit in this question, "Why should members of the U.N. feel that they can or should collectively unravel the horror we have unilaterally perpetrated?" Even ignoring the hyperbole of the rhetoric, since
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when is national holiness a prerequisite for U.N. action? "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."

Due to the information gap or to the reality of the situation itself, Dr. Brown is justly alarmed that the Administration does not appear to be investigating other alternatives to the pure military pressure in achieving peace and justice in Vietnam. However, he goes on in Section 5 to make this sage comment concerning the delineation of alternatives: "we do not have the expertise for that." Surely a man who has spoken so authoritatively on Vietnam politics, world communism, and the use of military ordnance should not be at a loss for words here! If he does not feel personally qualified, at least he could have quoted one or two of the alternatives delineated by those who are. Truly, we are not interested in "Brown's Plan for Extrication of Our Forces from Vietnam with Minimum loss to All Concerned"; neither have we found much light in the other Brown Plans. But we are interested in practical alternatives to our present course in Vietnam. Alas, we seek in vain.

Leaving the image phrase "wholesale slaughter" in the Chicago stockyards where it belongs, let us proceed to the recent crisis in Dr. Brown's life. "Until very recently I was virtually at the point of thinking there was no alternative to civil disobedience;..." This is unfortunate in a man with such learning, for it is obvious that few of the avenues of redress in our democracy have been traversed by those who dissent. After listing four very influential senators with alternative proposals to our course in Vietnam, how can he say that "the political spectrum seemed bare." Does he really think so little of President Johnson to believe that he would continue present policies in the face of a Congress aroused by public opinion? Even pure politics would deem that suicide. With a number of prominent people speaking against our present course and with the millions for whom these men speak, where are the radio and television programs to arouse public opinion in a responsible manner? Where are the printed articles and letters presenting the cogent logic which only truth possesses? In short, where is the truth? "Reason and free inquiry dispel error", so said our founding fathers. Let those who dissent take to the streets less and to their studies more. Civil disobedience in the streets is an inappropriate hangover from the desperate situation of Negro civil rights and a cheap, mindless way to obtain publicity. It does not persuade, it intimidates, and in that it is reminiscent historically of the ways of error, the ways of imposing the will of the minority upon the majority. If in their
mindless blindness those who dissent have seen no other alternative to civil disobedience, we all can be thankful that the candidacy of Senator Eugene McCarthy has penetrated their mental walls of fatuous frustration. Hopefully, Senator Robert Kennedy may have even more armor-piercing capability.

There can be no doubt that the churches as well as other organizations and men have failed to carefully analyse the Vietnam dilemma. And it is a dilemma, a problem seemingly incapable of a satisfactory solution, because both hawks and doves and the other members of the Vietnam aviary have relied upon silence or propaganda, intimidation or intransigence. Therefore "America should tremble at the thought that God is just" and when she truly does, we will find our ground covered with hawk feathers and our kitchen sinks clogged with dove down. Maybe then we will be ready for reason and free inquiry.

In his Personal Postscript, Dr. Brown eloquently expresses what it is like to be in the struggling minority. To doubt his patriotism or sincerity would be inane. And yet my continuing doubt upon his cogency is strengthened even here. In his last paragraph, Dr. Brown presents a quote which he suggests "as a source of strength to all who, like myself, get very weary and discourage when the brickbats are flying." But it would be difficult for any sensitive man of principle to say, "I don't regret any of the times I stick my neck out for what I then thought right;..." unless he believes himself to be sinless. We never find the Apostle Paul making that statement, for he knew what we must know, that there are more times than we would like to admit when we have defended that which was later shown to be wrong. Our attitude then can only be one of contrition, not of self-congratulation.

But I would be not fair to myself or Dr. Brown if I did not present some proposal for peace and justice in Vietnam. The following three options will not deal with the moral issue as I believe that this issue is too involved to be revealing. Let us just look at three "where-do-we-go-from-here" ideas. I believe the primary requirement for peace and justice in South Vietnam is for the South Vietnamese government to win the hearts and minds of the people. Once this has been accomplished, the threat of communism will be reduced to manageable proportions. However, most tragically, there has been little to indicate that the leaders of their present government are out to win anything else but personal fortunes. In that case, all the military victories in the world will not give us peace or justice in South Vietnam. Therefore, the United States should implement one of the following plans.

1. If the South Vietnamese government demonstrates that it can win the hearts and minds of the people within, say, a
one year period, the United States should continue her defense until the job of viable government is completed. The total period of United States commitment shall not exceed five years.

2. If the South Vietnamese government does not demonstrate that it can win the hearts and minds of the people within the allotted period, the United States should withdraw its military forces. If the government properly desires to win the people's allegiance, but is inept, it may choose to follow Plan 3.

3. If the South Vietnamese government cannot win the hearts and minds of the people and is willing to turn over government of the country to the United States for a maximum period of five years, then the United States should continue defense of the country until a South Vietnamese government can be trained to win allegiance. The total period of United States commitment shall not exceed five years.

The actual time periods used in these options (not panaceas) should, of course, be decided by those who know better. All of these plans basically follow the motto, "You shape up or we'll ship out." I have deliberately avoided the word "Democracy" as I do not feel that this is a live option for Vietnam in the near future. Perhaps a benevolent dictatorship is more practical, considering the education and culture of the people. Any talk of a coalition government, as far as Vietnam is concerned, is still a dictatorship, only by committee. Plan 2 simply states that if the South Vietnamese government does not wish to make the personal sacrifices of fortunes and corruption necessary to win allegiance, then we should not be pouring our lives and money into an abyss. Plan 3 rings of true colonialism, imperialism at its grandest. This should be the kind of colonialism that produced an independent Philippines: the same kind of imperialism that helped make Japan the most prosperous nation in Asia (with Nationalist China and South Korea as runner-ups.)

If we are to make any headway in our analysis of Vietnam, we must pull ourselves from the moral morass in which each man is right in his own eyes and move to consider the various options presently available to deal with today's situation. Both hawk and dove must stop preening their moral virtues, leave their perches of mutual distrust, and start hunting together for peace and justice in Vietnam.
COMMENTING ON THE NEWS

by Paul K. Jewett

The irrational character of moral evil is evidenced in the fact that the victims of such evil are often its perpetrators. The March 1968 issue of Ebony Magazine documents an instructive case in point. Peter Fuld, a Frankfurt Jew, dies in 1932, leaving his millions to Ida Fuld, his widow, and his eleven year old son Peter. Hitler's rise began in 1933. Fearing for her son, Frau Fuld got him out of the fatherland. First he lived in Switzerland, then in London. When war broke out, Peter was sent to an intern camp in Canada. Meanwhile the Nazis confiscated the family fortune and all contact between mother and son was lost. Released as a Jewish refugee, Peter went to law school in Montreal. German citizens were not exactly popular at this time in Canada, and his was a lonely life. A Canadian girl, Ivy Lawrence, sat next to him in class and took an interest in the "wandering Jew," helping him draft letters to the Red Cross and the Quakers in an anxious quest for his mother. Ivy and Peter soon realized they had more in common than a concern to find his mother. In 1946 they graduated with highest honors in law and Peter returned to Europe, found his mother, recouped his fortunes, and, with Ivy, drew up plans for a house in Frankfurt, even picking out the furniture. But they were never married. Mrs. Fuld threatened suicide before she would become the mother-in-law of a black woman.

Peter's subsequent white marriage ended in divorce, and in March, 1962, he died of cancer. His will, which made provision to help children of mixed marriages, who suffer from discrimination, was bitterly contested by his mother, in the costliest probate action in the history of English law. And matters have yet to be resolved in the German courts.

One may react with incredulity at Frau Fuld's intransigence. How could one who has known the implacable hatred of German anti-semitism be so bitter against one of another dispossessed minority? But how different are we from the German "do-ager"? M. L. King, in his book, Where Do We Go From Here?, observes that statistics show full 80% of the American people agree with Frau Fuld; whites should not marry blacks. And many of these Americans carry Bibles in their hands. If love is a many-splendored thing, surely prejudice is a deeply blighting thing.

* * * * *
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Dear Editors:

Thank you for the article, "The Life-Saving Station." It is one of the best ever printed in THE OPINION.

Yours for more.

William Sanford LaSor

135 North Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101

(213) 449-1745, 681-9481 cable: FULLYSEM
STATIONERY AND SYMBOLISM
(Observations on Fuller's new letterhead)
by Ros Al

We have a new letterhead! The fourth (or is it the fifth?) in the Seminary's short history. When it comes to stationery, at least, we are not stationary. But there is something symbolic about stationery, and perhaps it is fitting in this day of growing liturgics to meditate upon it.

The former stationery was bold. It was squarely in the center. Of course the chief symbolism was a shield (we're on the defensive), and a crown (we have achieved?), and a cross—or was it a plus? The shield was fat, perhaps from too little social action. And the cross was purple, perhaps from holding our breath too long, and the crown was very small, perhaps the result of bringing headshrinkers into our family. And who ever saw any cross in Christendom with the dimensions of that one? It was a Red Cross turned purple. The symbolism of that I leave to you.

The new stationery shows that Fuller Theological Seminary has shifted far to the left. I particularly object because the position of my name conveys the same idea, and I'm a rugged muddle-of-the-road. (Muddle sic!) But look now at the multiplied symbolism that stands beneath the name! There is still the cross-and-crown-and-shield. The crown looks larger but the headshrinkers haven't failed—it is just the shield
that has slimmed down from more social action. And it has taken on a boxy shape—almost, but not quite, a square. We are still on the defensive. The cross is more historical in its proportions, but it has almost lost the cross-nature and has become principally the divisions of the herald, with upper dexter and upper sinister quite a bit smaller than the lower quadrants. Does that mean we have reduced the intellectual and increased the actional proportions?

But look further! There is a rate-maze! Perhaps that is the School of Psychology; but since the Seminary is trinitarian and not unitarian, we certainly must believe that the three schools are one, and whatever can be said of each can be said of all. Rat-maze; hmmm. But where are the rats? Is there any symbolism in their absence? I think it was in the Jewish Navy of St. Hiram that when the rats fled the ship they flew Ichabod at the yard-arm. I next tried the maze—and I got out! Give me a PhD! But horror of horrors, I found that I was only able to get out by constantly turning to the left. Is that symbolic, I wonder?

In desperation for some certainty I turned to the remaining symbol, which by simple deduction must be the School of World Mission. At first I thought it was electrifying, and thought of the computer. And the sparks were pointing to the right! But on closer examination, I found that the electricity had gone. Perhaps only a fuse—but it could mean that the power source had
been cut off. Then as I looked, I saw a wheel, turning and turning, turning ever left, and getting nowhere. Then I looked again and I saw a world, a world that had escaped from the rat-maze, a world divided, but the divisions (a faint cross) were so small that they had almost disappeared.

Finally at the extreme lower right, I saw the cable address: FULLSEM. Flotsam and jetsam, and shades of the Flood. Why not PLENIOR?

Then I awoke from the dream. And I noticed a very important fact: THE NEW LETTERHEAD WOULD FORCE ME TO WRITE MORE TO THE RIGHT THAN EVER BEFORE! And I took up my pen and wrote.
The Anatomy of Student Government

or

Love is a many splendored thing

by Richard A. Bower

I think it appropriate at this time of pending student-body elections to make another effort to explain and illustrate the organizational structure of student government. This is usually done at the New Student Retreat and in the Student Handbook. Since, however, students are either too starry-eyed or prematurely cynical at new student retreats, and since the Student Handbook—next to Dr. Bromiley's article on "Why Study Theology" (Fuller Catalog)—is probably the least read of the Seminary's publications, seldom does any of this sink in.

It seemed to me that if I could link a description of student government with some lucid, tantalizing illustration (in good homiletical style), this description would gain a more enthusiastic and lasting reception. It immediately occurred to me that the most attractive illustration I could use would be that of joyous femininity. (The women in our midst can make, mutatis mutandis, their own appropriate applications.) We shall, therefore liken student government to the image of feminine beauty and personality. If it may be said that the total conception of feminine charm is the result of three basic factors, so too it is with student government.

1. First, there is the obvious charm and glamour of the female: her own attractive, irresistible grace (not to be understood theologically), her physical beauty, etc. Here we speak of the obvious, the external, readily apparent character of a woman. In student government we have a parallel. With the five main elected officers (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Church-in-Mission Coordinator) we have student government personified. These are the ones who receive all the praise or blame, the ones who stand in the public eye as the embodiment of all that is right and just (or otherwise) in student government. This characterization is not without merit (also not to be meant theologically), for upon these Five rest the main burden of responsibility and initiative in the business of student government.

2. Secondly, as a woman is characterized by external charm and beauty, so too is there an internal core of personality to which the external must answer. This is that side of a woman (which many of you may have experienced) which is often full of surprises. Here the unbeatable cunning and wit of a woman, her capacity for disarming and 'hog tying' her foe, as well as for soothing her friends, is seen. Here we learn

* * * * *
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that there is more to femininity than 'meets the eye.' So, too, in student government the 'glamour' of the Five is tempered by the cool sagacity of the Fifteen (or so). We speak here of the Student Council. Through this body (made up of the five elected student body officers, class presidents and class representatives, the opinion editor, dorm council representatives, School of Psychology and School of Missions representatives) the majority of legislative decisions are made. In theory all decisions are made by the Council; but in practice, the Council delegates much responsibility to the President and his appointed committee members. So behind the glamour lies the real woman; behind the President and his cabinet lies the Council.

3. Lastly, there is that aspect—that necessary aspect—of femininity we discover only too late. One might speak of the raw materials of femininity: you know, the layers of this or that creme, the curlers, the numerous odd garments, the hours of 'manufacturing'! All of this lies behind the scene, and rightfully so. But all of this is necessary for the final product—the glamour of femininity, as it were. In student government we have a similar phenomenon: That of the many committees, task forces, class governments, etc. Here is where the lion's share of the work is done—hidden, behind the scenes, and without glory. The committee structure of student government is all appointed by the President or his delegates. This is done so as to enable the President to accomplish his chosen goals. Committee appointments are subject to approval by the Student Council. The committees exist to do the work of student government, and thus to serve the students. Some serve the students more directly than do others. For example, there is a Student Academic Affairs Committee which serves as a court of appeals for students with problems or suggestions in matters academic. This student committee can speak directly to the Faculty Academic Affairs Committee. Other committees are more task oriented, such as the Spring Banquet Committee. A list of all committees can be found on page 3 of the Student Handbook.

In summary: just as the totality of feminine charm is dependent upon the totality of that which goes to make up this charm, so too student government is more than 'meets the eye.' It is a combination of structures which join together to make the total strength of this government. It is a specific leadership joined to a legislative power, and undergirded by a labor force of committees.

I hope, therefore, that the next time you are strongly attracted to some feminine charm, you will recall in detail all that I have said regarding the organizational structure of our student government. (Better yet, perhaps the mere mention of student government will sweetly lead to fond thoughts of feminine beauty.)
Dear Sir: (Re: "Advent Litany" published in the March issue)

Silent prayer is preferable to overgeneralization in corporate prayer. Especially is this true when the writer of the "Litany" does not examine his work in the light of the Scriptures.

Responsible I must be for my own actions; for what I can change I will give account to God. But Mr. G. Appleton's attempted expression of corporate Christian guilt for everything from drunkenness to untimely death of the young made me wonder if he was a member of the church on North El Molino where they teach baptism on behalf of the dead.

Mr. Appleton (and whoever would use his prayers in our chapel services), if you wish to teach me concerning my social responsibilities, do it forthrightly, and in the proper situation. But don't sneak up on me with theological confusion while I'm praying.

Nils Friberg

Dear Sir:

As a member of the opinion editorial staff, I would like to offer a few words of clarification with respect to Ken Birch's letter in the last issue. I think his concern for an objective and unemotional approach to the problem of Vietnam is a good one and well worth heeding by all of us, regardless of which side we line up on. And his remarks on "Time of the Locust" are, at the very least, worthy of consideration.

But my immediate interest is in the quite explicit charge made of dishonesty on the part of the opinion. This journal has demonstrated in various ways where its sympathies lie with regard to Vietnam. Mr. Birch knows this and, for some reason, is upset. But why? Because "some very basic reasons for the American presence in Vietnam have not been given adequate consideration"? Granting the possible truthfulness of this claim, wherein lies the dishonesty? The staff of the opinion has a fairly unanimous point of view on many topics and this viewpoint reveals itself in editorial comments, themes chosen for given issues and in the material reprinted from other sources. Apart from this, the opinion is ready and willing to print virtually anything presented to it in readable form, or to use the words found on the front page, "the opinion welcomes a variety of opinions consistent with general academic standards". The apparently one-sided treat-
ment of many issues often reflects a lack of interest, on the part of those who hold other views, to write something for us. A good many promised articles, in response to previous issues, never make it to the editor's desk.

Wherein, then lies the dishonesty? Unfortunately this never got spelled out. If Mr. Birch intended (and I'm not sure he did) to make any kind of simple identification of the opinion with either the film, "Time of the Locust" or the "Inquiry Vietnam Committee", this would display a regrettable lack of the sober-mindedness he pleads for. If, on the other hand, no such identification was meant, then the charge of dishonesty should have been explained.

I should point out in closing that the reading list found in a recent editorial (January, 1968) includes the name of Robert Scalapino, a Berkeley political scientist recognized as an articulate and highly intelligent defender of American involvement. Further, the editor's article, "Hawks, Doves and Ostriches", in the same issue, can hardly be construed as one-sided. In fact, it would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to know on which side he stands, if this article were all one had to judge by.

Mr. Birch's closing appeal for the use of reason and the abolition of emotionalism has an odd ring in the total context of his remarks. Perhaps his earlier reference to being "violently "turned-off" gives a better description of the tone of his letter.

Chuck Twombley