1. Acknowledging that man's chief end is to glorify God through his life and service, we affirm the centrality of worship in the life of the Christian community and in the life of the individual Christian.

We who engage in the task of theological reflection must do so in the context of worship, because our theology must always be confessional in character, thus demanding the context of prayer and adoration and the hearing of God's Word. There is no more difficult and potentially dangerous task for the Christian than that of theological reflection, whereby we reduce the mysteries of God to the level of human discourse and debate. Apart from the discipline of worship, we inevitably approach the ways and works of God with profane hands.

Our worship in the theological community must first of all be corporate in nature, because the task of theology is a corporate one; theology is not a private affair. We speak in the church, with the church, for the church, and to the church. This corporate task is reflected in the fact that we study together, eat together, and live together. Is it not self-evident that we ought above all to worship together?

2. True worship is a gift of God. Regular practice of corporate praise and prayer is essential to our seminary community, and is the sole function of the Chapel Service.

3. Worship as a complete act of God's address and our response should include the following:
   a. Praise - because God is Lord over all and worthy of praise.
   b. Proclamation (Scripture and Preaching) - because man as a Christian lives by the Word of God.
   c. Confession of sins - because we have need daily to acknowledge our corporate and individual sin and to receive assurance of pardon.
   d. Response of prayer and affirmation of faith - because it is the joyous service of Christians to respond to God's gracious address in Christ.

* * * * *

This statement on Chapel as worship was drawn up by the Chapel Committee last Fall and published in the October 1967 issue of the opinion (Vol. VII, No. 1). We reprint it here so that all may be aware of the policy which will continue to guide chapel services through the quarter.
These four elements (i.e. those listed in paragraph 3 of the Chapel Committee's statement) are not expressed only by four particular activities; there are a great variety of different ways in which they can be done. Nor are activities necessarily limited to accomplishing just one of these elements; for example, a given hymn or a prayer may accomplish two or more of these elements. Some ways of achieving variety in worship services are to vary the sequence of the various elements; to have the audience (congregation) take part as well as listen; to have private as well as public prayer and confession; to have corporate as well as individual participation; to use written forms as well as spontaneous, individual responses; to let the congregation suggest items of praise, need, etc., as well as for the leader to suggest these. In your planning of the service, feel free to be creative and original in the order of service and in the forms used. The only caution, perhaps, is that the goal of chapel should be worship of God, a confrontation with and response to God Himself; the goal shouldn't be novelty as an end in itself.

*This statement on the relationship between elements of worship and forms of worship is the current policy of the Chapel Committee on this matter. We reprint it so that the entire scope of the present policy may be understood.*
Our theme is worship, our text is from Psalm 96: "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name," and we should also have at the back of our minds the first petition of the Lord's Prayer: Hallowed by thy name.

Four aspects of the theme claim our attention: I. The Call to Worship; II. The Focus of Worship; III. The Reason for Worship; and IV. The Elements of Worship.

I. The Call to Worship. Like all God's calls, this carries within it:
1. The invitation of God. Worship is a privilege and not just a duty. God graciously permits us to engage in it; we should receive the call with gladness.
2. The exhortation of God. We approve of worship in theory but find it hard to practice. God encourages us to do this; we should receive the call with shame and renewal.
3. The command of God. Worship is not an optional extra but something which God requires; we should receive the call with obedience.

II. The Focus of Worship. What is the central point, the focus of worship? We may consider two false or subsidiary foci and then a third - the true and primary focus.
1. The worshipper is not the center of the stage. Worship is not just part of training, edification, getting a worship experience, learning about worship, getting in any sense. What is received is subsidiary.
2. The brethren are not the center of the picture. We do not worship merely to give to others, to engage in common edification. What is given to others is important but subsidiary.
3. God is the true focus of worship. As the first commandment is to love the Lord our God, the first petition is that His name be hallowed. Worship is giving - giving honor to God, as God graciously permits us. If we can give only as we have received, in worship we net, or get for others, only as we give to God.

Geoffrey W. Bromiley is Professor of Church History and Historical Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary. This article is a precis of a sermon given in Chapel on October 17, 1968.
III. The Reason for Worship. Why should we worship God? We are not to seek the reason in ourselves, except in so far as God has made us what we are. We seek the reason in God.

1. As noted already, God commands us to worship; this is reason enough.
2. Yet God is to be worshipped because He is who He is and has done what He has done. The command is no arbitrary one but has reason and content.
3. Since God is who He is and has done what He has done, honor is due to Him. It is natural to honor outstanding people or achievements; how much more so God! Note that the glory is due - the reason is a binding one, not subject to our fads or feelings.

IV. The Elements of Worship. In what does worship consist? Two elements may be taken from the psalm directly, and two others indirectly.

1. Praise. We glorify God by praising Him for who He is and what He does.
2. Proclamation. Praising God, we declare, rehearse, set forth His saving works.
3. Indirectly confession in the double sense:
   a. we confess our faith in Him by praise and proclamation;
   b. we confess our sin before Him as those who praise Him for His work of salvation and trust His grace.
4. Indirectly petition and intercession. Praising and proclaiming Him as the God who sustains and saves, we are bold to seek His provision for ourselves and others.
I think there is some hope for my youngest son. He is showing signs of becoming a man. The problem is cereal. Somehow when he was very young the combination of Madison Avenue and his own taste buds got him hooked. For several years it was Cheerios, and for a while I thought of getting it by the carload. Not that I was totally dismayed by this. After all, it's better than being ape for candy, or marijuana. He ate the stuff at any hour of the day or night, and especially for breakfast.

Then I noticed a subtle change. He began to discover that there are other kinds of cereal, and he began to insist on the privilege of going to the store with his mother and picking out these new additions. We had to increase the available shelf space to house the expanded selection, but that was all right with me. He was still my boy, and he liked cereal, especially for breakfast.

My wife was always a bit concerned about this. She was a strict "protein-for-breakfast" person, and she felt alarmed about his consuming nothing but cereal. She does cook up some delicious eggs, and in great variety, I might add. Saturdays we even slip in waffles, and special coffee rolls on Sunday morning, but this didn't mean much to the boy. Semper fidelis, cereal.

But as I said at the beginning, there is hope. He's beginning to show some expanded interest. Not a lot, mind you. After all, he's only fifteen. Now the orange juice is getting the nod from time to time, and it's frequently only one bowl of cereal because he's having some eggs, thank you - poached, boiled or scrambled.

Robert N. Schaper is Dean of Students and Assistant Professor of Practical Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary.
But if you want to know what really thrills me about this whole thing, well, it's the fact that he's beginning to see that there is more to our breakfast together than the eating.

It started when we wouldn't let him read the cereal boxes during breakfast. He's my son, you know, and I don't want him to feel that he's doing me a favor just by eating my cereal, though I'm glad for him to have it. He's getting to be a busy boy, and breakfast can be a good time for us to know each other. Maybe it's a father's pride, but I like to think that the older he gets the more he will value breakfast time because he is with me and I want him there, not just because of what he eats. We may even have eggs Benedict some morning.

MUSINGS OF A CHAPEL COMMITTEE MEMBER

As a member of the Chapel Committee I have been most impressed by the sincere attempt of the Committee to assume a pastoral role for the guidance of one segment of the life of the seminary community, an extremely important segment. I say pastoral because I conceive of it in just that term. The seminary is not a church in the normative use of the word. It does not administer baptism, which in some sense for all Christians is the great evangelical sign, the glad response to the Gospel, the seal of incorporation. It does not attempt to administer Christian discipline.

Yet the obvious unity of purpose and the common commitment of students and faculty creates a bond of fellowship and function that cannot be ignored. A community of students destined for leadership in churches will inevitably organize itself in such a way that its ideals will be expressed, its theology symbolized. The faculty, along with the students, assumes a spiritual responsibility for the well-being of the community. This is pastoral.

At present that pastoral concern has expressed itself in establishing a service of corporate worship four days a week. I presume that the faculty could alter the schedule and provide such a service five days a week. The present rationale centers on the seeming propriety of a worship service in the center of the regular days of seminary instruction.

I am enthusiastically for this arrangement. I would like to think that the entire seminary community would welcome such
an opportunity. I cannot say that I see this prescribed in scripture (daily corporate worship), but if I love God and love my Christian brothers, then the opportunity for such corporate worship should be welcome. I admit to a certain arbitrariness in the arrangement, but there seems to be solid reasoning behind it. There is certainly no lack of resource to make it something worthwhile. We have a faculty full of mini

...ers, a student body of great ability and variety, and neighbors of genuine dedication and skill. We have many hymns to learn, liturgies to explore, worship forms to share. We need to pray, praise, repent, rejoice and obey.

Those who are going to be ministers most certainly need the discipline and devotion of the chapel. If worship is either so individualized or so inconsequential in your thinking that you can make the chapel a pleasant option easily preempted, then do not be surprised if you are unable to lead Christians into paths of responsible and consistent commitment. If you are still looking at the Seminary to see who will speak at chapel, you have forgotten Who calls you to worship. If I expect the Lord to speak through a clod like me, then I had better listen for His voice in other clods, student and faculty.

I have the feeling that our offering of time to God, time that we often think we can ill afford, is rather like our stewardship of money. The Christian, not under law, does well to begin where the poorest Jew had to begin, the tithe. Then, constantly prodding himself to greater generosity, he had a right to trust God for help and guidance in the management of his remaining funds. I would like to feel that God will bless me in my endeavors (not necessarily bless my endeavors) as I seek to glorify Him under the pastoral guidance of the community in which He has placed me.

Robert N. Schaper.

* * * * *

Dr. Schaper offers this second article as a commentary on his cryptic "On Chapel at Fuller Seminary".
"Who goes to Heaven?" is as simple a question as a man can ask. The answer, too, for the believer, is almost stark in its simplicity: "He goes to Heaven who accepts Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior."

Conservative Christianity has fought for nearly 2,000 years to prevent any further qualifications from being added to that simple answer. At times, in fact, the Church has been so vigorous in its defense of the biblical doctrine of salvation that it has had neither time nor inclination to advance any positive understanding of that doctrine. Our fundamentalist fathers, for instance, might well have benefitted from a reminder of that old maxim, "The best defense is a good offense."

I am no expert in Church History, at any stage of its development, but of this I am convinced: Those churches of today who most loudly and rigorously insist that Jesus Christ is the only Way to Heaven tend to be the ones most devoid of understanding of what they are saying.

Liberalism and Modernism, too, have noticed this phenomenon and have thereby been strengthened in their conviction that the Church ought to be less dogmatic about such doctrines as man's utter sinfulness, his need of radical conversion, and his salvation-or-hell destiny.

The Evangelical, however, would prefer to see a thoroughly biblical understanding of salvation prevail, rather than a partial or total dismissal of the doctrine. To that end, may I suggest that, among our conservative laymen and pastors, if not among our professional theologians, the most common and serious misunderstanding of the doctrine of salvation lies precisely at this point: We simply do not believe that we have been crucified with Christ (Romans 6:1-11) and that "if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation." (II Corinthians 5:17)

Mike Hayes is a Middler at Fuller Seminary. He graduated from Sonoma State College in 1985 with a B.A. in psychology. This article is the first of a two-part series.
It is not so much the problem that we have a distorted understanding of such passages, but that we have no understanding. It is not that we incorporate into our thinking and our attitudes unclear or mistaken explanations of these points, but that we ignore them. We pay them no more heed in our lives or from our pulpits than if Paul had labeled them "The Teachings of Satan."

The problem with our understanding of who goes to Heaven, then, is that we believe and feel that the man who has "been saved" is no different than the unbeliever who would rather spit in the fact of Jesus Christ than acknowledge any need of salvation - except that the former is so-show going to be smuggled into heaven under Jesus' robe of righteousness.

The way most people speak of being "sinners saved by grace" or "covered with the blood" brings to my mind the chairs that my wife and I once had in our living room. They were old, dirty, and badly worn chairs which we had salvaged from the rafters of my parents' garage. They needed to be re-padded and reupholstered, but we chose instead a cheap conversion - slip covers.

The doctrine of slip-cover conversion has poisoned our minds for too long. Is it really so difficult to see that to claim that the man who is saved is no different than he was before his conversion, except that now he is covered by the grace and blood of Christ, is to say that God is guilty of deceiving Himself?

When God looks at a Christian, will He see the Christian or will He be as blind as Isaac and mistake a covering for the real thing? If Jesus Christ cannot change me, but can only hide me from the Father, is His only power the power of deception?

God forbid! I must, I must consider myself dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. I must believe that - if I am a Christian at all - I am a new creation.

Or else I must believe that Christianity is only a divine hoax...
My dear Wormwood,

You have been doing an excellent job with your patient at the Seminary, the one who wanted to be an informed, capable ambassador of the Enemy. He is beginning to think the right thoughts more consistently now. Make the most of his feeling that if he misses his early morning quiet time his day will be ruined. Enough of these feelings of failure might make him doubt his calling, or even - hopefully - his salvation. You might show him some of the Enemy's dedicated men in worldly professions and help him see that this, not the pastorate, is really where the action is and where he can be most effective for the Enemy.

Your goal is to keep him from being an effective worker for the Enemy. Encourage him in his view that Chapel is of no consequence to him, since he worships twice on Sunday. Make him react to structured worship; it gives him too much solid content and leads to the experience of being unified with other members of the Enemy's "body" (an idea hard to understand but most threatening to us).

Keep him at his books and away from people. You can capitalize on his feeling that Seminary is a 3- or 4-year training program in which he must excel. Keep him competing for grades and worrying about examinations.

Remember: you can use both the academic and the emotional extremes to achieve our goal - your patient's uselessness to the Enemy. In any case, do not let him achieve any sort of balance.

Your affectionate uncle,

SCREWTAPE

---

Jim Bidderman is a middler at Fuller Theological Seminary. He graduated from UCLA in 1966 with a B.S. in psychology.
WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE WHOLE COUNSEL OF GOD?
(a resolution to remedy evil)
by Wallace Cable

Whereas: Inconvenience suffering and difficulty have been enacted upon one people by another, and

Whereas: Misunderstanding is being fostered in the former's behalf, and

Whereas: The mission of the church is what it is to those in need, and

Whereas: The necessity has arisen to demonstrate the compassion of God upon a people misunderstood and prejudged, and

Whereas: There is in the Central Valley of this fair state a specific ministry to perform among such a people who need help, concern, understanding, loving and caring, and

Whereas: In this small way the Christian mission can be demonstrated succinctly and practically to real people with real problems, needing the positive help and counsel only Christ can give. Let it be

Resolved: That the mission of the church be demonstrated in word as well as in deed to a people in need. And be it further

Resolved: That a message of concern in this time of need (for as long as it may last) be dispatched immediately to the vineyard owners of the Delano area. And be it further

Resolved: That, accompanying this message, be an offer to volunteer immediate harvesting and vinedressing assistance of ourselves, or to obtain assistance from any source deemed necessary to consult.

*  *  *  *  *  *  *

Or may the church give aid on both sides of an altercation, specifically a labor dispute? Or should it? From

*  *  *  *  *

Wallace Cable is a graduate of Azusa-Pacific College and a middler at Fuller Theological Seminary.
the actions of some of our fellow students and respected faculty, one would assume not.

But is their conditional good-will the mission of the church on earth? Or is it one-sided assistance to only those whose hurt and need appeal more easily to the heart-strings? Or is it the result of the presupposition that capital and land ownership must somehow be bad? Or maybe it really is true sympathy with a deprived people. But if so, what about both sides? Which side needs Christ? Let us put it this way: Which side does not need the aid and help of Christ?

Let us not fall into the error of choosing the side to be the receiver when administering the gifts of the church. Let us have a balanced view of the mission of Christ in the whole world rather than a buttressing of one man against his brother. Let us give freely of peace to the world as we have received it from Christ, instead of taking sides so absolutely certain that our hero in the struggle is in the right. Let us remember that Christ died for all men, not just for the group striking for higher wages.
Funny how faces change
and streets slowly rearrange themselves
The future seems to run in front of us
one endless monorail
But children are asking yesterday's questions
Clocks and watches run in yesterday's direction
And I'm getting tired of learning
new words to redefine the same thing,
of painting new faces on old timepieces --
to declare the new translation,
the product of last year's advanced thinking.

Whatever credit invention may find in automobiles
and wireless telephones
It must forfeit in dealing with
the fundamental questions of life.
It follows then, that every man,
yet, needs God whether he believes in
Him or not.
For though the sandbox arts of
building and taking apart may be used to
carefully categorize every new-found substance
An Infinite Being is needed to deal with
the philosophy of the transcendental.

It's a shame that children ask the basic questions
more than adults.
When the child asks why he is a child
the mother launches into biology,
the teacher speaks of mental maturity,
the bio-chemist mutters on about enzymes and
amino acids,
the psychologist is preoccupied with early
development theories,
the philosopher advises the child to wait
until college or gives a nursery rhyme,
the avant-garde minister says something
about the Ground of all Being and sets a
plastic deity before the child—this year's model.

** * * * * *
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Everyone busily describes the child and his immediate surroundings. The cross gradually becomes a dainty symbol of poetic pain and stained glass sorrows. Children these days must wander by accident into the right empty tomb to look for a body. And the clergy must allow the resting place to be conspicuously empty, and not, figuratively, stuff the linen with their ideas to ease the minds of people too busy redefining air to answer a child's question of why we breathe.

A PRAYER
by Margaret Thornton

You know, Lord—better than anyone else—
How it feels to be "left out".
There are so many times that we don't include you in our thoughts—
Even though we truly love you.
Help me, Lord, not to leave you out.
For then I shall be more careful with those I love—
Careful to make them feel "left in" at each moment.
Make me ever sensitive to their thoughts and feelings,
And let no act or word or even a look
Make them feel outside of my love.
I pray, Lord, that I may never see hurt in their eyes
Because I have failed to let them know they are always in my heart.

* * * * *
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sirs:

It appears to me that there is shallow thinking being vocalized in regard to the current Chapel format. There are those who are proposing that one chapel period per week be substituted for a Window on the World presentation. I wish to call attention to the basis of such a suggestion.

Most of us come from pietistic backgrounds and we have no trouble coming down hard on such acts as personal Bible study and personal prayer. In fact, to suggest that we eliminate one day's Quiet Time in favor of reading through the latest issue of MISSIONARY ANTHROPOLOGY would invite charges of heresy. But to the degree that most of us are strong on acts of personal devotion, we are weak on corporate piety. Corporate worship has never received the emphasis that the daily Quiet Time has, but I trust that our seminary experience will bring all of us face to face with this imbalance. Corporate worship is not only generically related to personal worship but I would venture to say that it receives the greater New Testament stress as the proper posture for the people of God.

If our schedule is such that it permits us the privilege of worshipping four days a week, then to suggest that Window on the World replace even just one of these chapels is to say that corporate worship is optional. It also says that worship is subject to being preempted by an informative lecture. However, no matter how inspiring that information may be, we have no authority to regard it even as an equivalent to the acts of worship; i.e., praise, confession, prayer, exposition of Scripture, response, etc.

If some would rate Window on the World so highly, than surely it must be worthy of preempting a regularly scheduled class. And then, too, perhaps one day a week we ought to read the Church Growth Bulletins for our Quiet Time; since we are too busy to read them otherwise. I do not wish to demean the need for a Window on the World presentation; but rather, to ask that we not equate it with corporate worship.

Sincerely,

Fred Wagner